

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER OF THE:)
)
LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING)
COMMITTEE MEETING)
_____)

DATE AND TIME: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1997
9:30 A.M.

PLACE: BOARD HEARING ROOM
8800 CAL CENTER DRIVE
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, RPR, CSR
 CERTIFICATE NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 38901

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

APPEARANCES

MR. WESLEY CHESBRO, CHAIRMAN
MR. ROBERT C. FRAZEE, MEMBER
MS. JANET GOTCH, MEMBER (NOT PRESENT)

STAFF PRESENT

MR. ELLIOT BLOCK, LEGAL COUNSEL
MS. KATHY MARSH, COMMITTEE SECRETARY
MS. JUDY FRIEDMAN
MS. CAREN TRGOVCICH

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

I N D E X

	PAGE_NO.

CALL TO ORDER	6
EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS	6
ITEM 1: REPORT FROM DIVERSION, PLANNING, AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION.	7
ITEM 2: REPORT ON WASTE PREVENTION ACTIVITIES OF THE WASTE PREVENTION AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT DIVISION.	13
ITEM 3: CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA:	22
ITEM 4: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF LAKEWOOD, LOS ANGELES COUNTY.	
ITEM 5: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES COUNTY.	
ITEM 6: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF MONTEBELLO, LOS ANGELES COUNTY.	
ITEM 8: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT FOR THE UNINCORPORATED NAPA COUNTY.	
ITEM 9: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT, HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT, AND NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF AMERICAN CANYON, NAPA COUNTY.	
ITEM 10: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF SANTA CLARA,	

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

SANTA CLARA COUNTY.

ITEM 11: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF
RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE COUNTYWIDE
SITING ELEMENT AND SUMMARY PLAN FOR THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

ITEM 12: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF
RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SUMMARY
PLAN FOR SOLANO COUNTY.

ITEM 13: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF
RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE
REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT, HOUSEHOLD
HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT, AND NONDISPOSAL FACILITY
ELEMENT FOR IF YOU CITY OF RIO VISTA, SOLANO
COUNTY.

ITEM 7: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON
THE ADEQUACY ON THE TWO-YEAR TIME EXTENSION FOR
MEETING THE DIVERSION REQUIREMENTS OF THE
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1989 FOR THE
CITY OF GREENFIELD, MONTEREY COUNTY.

STAFF PRESENTATION	23
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	25
ACTION	26

ITEM 14: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS
REGARDING ENFORCEMENT OPTIONS FOR JURISDICTIONS
THAT HAVE FAILED TO FILE ADEQUATE SOURCE REDUCTION
AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND/OR NONDISPOSAL FACILITY
ELEMENTS, INCLUDING: COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES, PUBLIC
HEARING PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA FOR PENALTIES.

STAFF PRESENTATION	27
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	32
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	34
ACTION	46, 56

ITEM 15: CONSIDERATION OF AWARD OF THE 1996
CALMAX MATCH OF THE YEAR AND PROGRAM UPDATE.

STAFF PRESENTATION	56
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	61, 74
ACTION	78

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

ITEM 16: CONSIDERATION OF SELECTION OF THE RPPC
ALL-CONTAINER RECYCLING RATE METHODOLOGY.

STAFF PRESENTATION	87
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	96, 104, 114
ACTION	117

ITEM 17: UPDATE ON THE 1997 WASTE REDUCTION
AWARDS PROGRAM.

STAFF PRESENTATION	79
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	
ACTION	

ITEM 18: OPEN DISCUSSION	120
--------------------------	-----

ITEM 19: ADJOURNMENT	126
----------------------	-----

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1997
2 9:30 A.M.
3
4 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: GOOD MORNING. THIS IS
5 THE MEETING OF THE LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING
6 COMMITTEE OF THE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT
7 BOARD. WE WILL BEGIN BY CALLING THE ROLL, PLEASE.
8 THE SECRETARY: COMMITTEE MEMBERS FRAZEE.
9 MEMBER FRAZEE: HERE.
10 THE SECRETARY: GOTCH. ABSENT. CHAIRMAN
11 CHESBRO.
12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: HERE.
13 DO YOU HAVE ANY EX PARTES TO REPORT?
14 MEMBER FRAZEE: NO.
15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I HAVE SEVERAL. I
16 HAVE A COUPLE OF LETTERS FROM JERRY JAMGOTCHIAN
17 REGARDING THE CITY OF HAWTHORNE'S AB 939
18 COMPLIANCE AND ANNUAL REPORT, ETC., ETC. I ALSO
19 HAD A CONVERSATION, ALTHOUGH IT'S NOT ON THE
20 AGENDA TODAY, JUST WITH LARRY SWEETSER WITH
21 REGARDS TO THE BASE-YEAR NUMBERS ISSUE THAT WE'VE
22 BEEN DISCUSSING. HE'S REPRESENTING NORCAL.
23 SO THE FIRST AGENDA ITEM IS ORAL
24 REPORT BY JUDY FRIEDMAN FOR THE DIVERSION,
25 PLANNING, AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 MS. FRIEDMAN: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
2 CHESBRO AND COMMITTEE MEMBER. THIS ITEM IS AN
3 UPDATE ON SOME OF THE MAJOR ACTIVITIES OF THE
4 DIVERSION, PLANNING, AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE
5 DIVISION.

6 JUST A QUICK UPDATE ON LOCAL PLANS:
7 ELEMENTS OF TEN JURISDICTIONS ARE ON TODAY'S
8 AGENDA, AND THIS REPRESENTS FOUR SRRE'S, THREE
9 HHWE'S, FOUR NDFE'S, ONE SITING ELEMENT, TWO
10 SUMMARY PLANS, TWO CIWMP'S, AND A TWO-YEAR TIME
11 EXTENSION. AND WE WILL PRESENT AN UPDATE ON SRRE
12 AND NDFE SUBMITTALS IN THE ENFORCEMENT ITEM ALSO
13 ON TODAY'S AGENDA.

14 UPDATE ON LOCAL ASSISTANCE
15 ACTIVITIES: JURISDICTIONS HAVE RESPONDED TO THE
16 PLANNING COMMITTEE AND BOARD'S RECENT ACTION
17 REGARDING ENFORCEMENT OF PLAN ADEQUACY REQUIRE-
18 MENTS FOR SRRE'S. THE NOTIFICATION LETTERS AND
19 REQUESTS FOR COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES HAS SPURRED MANY
20 JURISDICTIONS INTO ACTION. STAFF ARE WORKING WITH
21 NUMEROUS JURISDICTIONS WHO ARE NOW SUPPLYING
22 NEEDED INFORMATION AND WORKING CLOSELY WITH US TO
23 RESOLVE ANY PROBLEM AREAS. AND WE ANTICIPATE THAT
24 WE'LL BRINGING PLANS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE AND
25 BOARD IN THE NEXT SEVERAL MONTHS.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 BASED ON THE BOARD'S RECENT ACTIONS
2 ON THE MEASUREMENT ACCURACIES WORKING GROUP
3 RECOMMENDATIONS OF REASONABLE OPTIONS FOR
4 CORRECTING MEASUREMENT INACCURACIES, STAFF IS
5 MOVING FORWARD WITH ASSISTING JURISDICTIONS WHO
6 HAVE REQUESTED CORRECTIONS IN THEIR ANNUAL
7 REPORTS. MANY JURISDICTIONS THROUGHOUT THE STATE
8 HAVE PRESENTED INFORMATION AND REQUESTED
9 CORRECTIONS.
10 BOARD STAFF IS MAKING A SPECIAL
11 EFFORT TOWARD RESOLVING THE PROBLEMS OF L.A.
12 COUNTY JURISDICTIONS AS DIRECTED BY THE BOARD. WE
13 ANTICIPATE THAT APPROXIMATELY TEN BASE-YEAR
14 CORRECTION ITEMS WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE
15 COMMITTEE AND BOARD IN MAY WITH MORE TO FOLLOW IN
16 FUTURE MONTHS.
17 STAFF IS BEGINNING THE TESTING PHASE
18 FOR THE PARIS, WHICH IS THE PLANNING ANNUAL
19 REPORTS INFORMATION SYSTEM. THIS SYSTEM WILL BE
20 USED TO COLLECT THE ANNUAL REPORT DATA SUBMITTED
21 BY JURISDICTIONS ON THE STATUS OF THEIR PROGRAM
22 IMPLEMENTATION AND DISPOSAL REDUCTION PROGRESS.
23 STAFF IS PREPARING TWO ARTICLES TO
24 BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY/JUNE ISSUE OF "CALIFORNIA
25 COUNTY MAGAZINE." ONE IS ON THE UPCOMING

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 WORKSHOPS ON THE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT
2 DISASTER PLAN AND ONE ON THE HHW DISASTER
3 COLLECTION EVENTS.
4 STAFF ASSISTED TEHAMA COUNTY BY
5 PREPARING A LIST OF QUESTIONS TO ASK PROPOSERS ON
6 THE COUNTY'S "CURBSIDE TO CLOSURE" RFP. THE
7 INFORMATION WILL BE CRAFTED INTO AN RFP REVIEW
8 ASSISTANCE DOCUMENT USABLE BY OTHER JURISDICTIONS.
9 SO WE HOPE TO USE THAT AS A MODEL FOR OTHER
10 JURISDICTIONS TO USE.
11 REGIONAL AGENCY STAFF CONTINUE TO
12 ENCOURAGE MONO AND INYO COUNTIES AND THE CITIES OF
13 THOSE COUNTIES TO FORM A REGIONAL AGENCY. STAFF
14 HAS ALSO BEEN WORKING WITH THE CITIES IN TULARE
15 COUNTY ON A REGIONAL AGENCY AGREEMENT AS WELL.
16 STAFF ARE PREPARING BOOTH EXHIBITS
17 AND A PRESENTATION ON THE CALF GIS OR CALIFORNIA
18 LANDFILL GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM, AND
19 LANDFILL STRATEGIES AND METHODOLOGIES FOR
20 DETERMINING CAPACITY FOR THE UPCOMING SWANA
21 CONFERENCE SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 27TH THROUGH MAY
22 1ST.
23 UPDATE ON USED OIL AND HOUSEHOLD
24 HAZARDOUS WASTE: DURING THE MONTH OF APRIL, 16
25 USED OIL COLLECTION CENTERS WERE CERTIFIED AND 14

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CENTERS WERE RECERTIFIED. AND TOTAL PROGRAM
2 PARTICIPANTS CURRENTLY ARE 2,241 CERTIFIED
3 CENTERS, 547 REGISTERED INDUSTRIAL GENERATORS, 71
4 REGISTERED CURBSIDE PROGRAMS, AND ONE REGISTERED
5 ELECTRIC UTILITY, AND WE HAVE A TOTAL OF 2,860
6 PARTICIPANTS.

7 CERTIFICATION STAFF CONDUCTED 30
8 SITE VISITS THROUGH THE MONTH OF MARCH. A TOTAL
9 OF 241 APPLICATIONS WERE SUBMITTED FOR THE FIFTH
10 CYCLE USED OIL BLOCK GRANTS. AND THIS REPRESENTS
11 503 OF THE 526 -- EXCUSE ME -- 531 JURISDICTIONS.
12 BECAUSE OF THE NEW MINIMUM GRANT AWARD AMOUNTS,
13 MANY CITIES AND COUNTIES APPLIED FOR THE FIRST
14 TIME.

15 STAFF PERFORMED A MAJOR OUTREACH
16 EFFORT TO ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION BY NEW
17 JURISDICTIONS, WHICH RESULTED IN AN ADDITIONAL 130
18 JURISDICTIONS APPLYING. ALL 58 COUNTIES IN THE
19 STATE APPLIED AND ONLY 23 CITIES DID NOT APPLY FOR
20 FUNDING. THE NEW AWARDS WILL PROVIDE USED OIL
21 PROGRAM FUNDING TO OVER 97.5 PERCENT OF THE STATE
22 POPULATION. SO THAT NEW MINIMUM PROCEDURE THAT
23 WE -- THE BOARD ADOPTED ADMINISTRATIVELY REALLY
24 HAS ALLOWED US TO EXPAND WHO WE'RE REACHING, SO
25 IT'S A GOOD THING.

1 ON MARCH 26TH THE BOARD APPROVED THE
2 CRITERIA AND SCORING PROCESS FOR THE FOURTH CYCLE
3 USED OIL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS, AND THE CRITERIA
4 FOCUSES HEAVILY ON THE NEED FOR THE PROJECT. THE
5 NEW APPLICATION FORMAT DEVELOPED THIS YEAR
6 INCLUDES AN EVALUATION COMPONENT TO ASSIST
7 JURISDICTIONS IN DEVELOPING THEIR APPLICATIONS.
8 THROUGH THE USED OIL FILTER PILOT
9 PROGRAM, STAFF HAS FACILITATED THE COOPERATION OF
10 THE COUNTIES OF SACRAMENTO AND LOS ANGELES WITH
11 KRAGEN AUTO PARTS TO COLLECT USED OIL FILTERS
12 WITHIN THOSE COUNTIES. SO THIS IS SOMETHING THAT
13 WE'RE REALLY TRYING TO GET OFF THE GROUND IS
14 ACTUALLY COLLECTION OF THE FILTERS AS WELL.
15 THE 1996 USED OIL RECYCLING RATE
16 REPORT HAS BEEN COMPLETED FROM INFORMATION
17 PROVIDED BY OIL MANUFACTURERS AND USED OIL
18 PROCESSING FACILITIES, AND THE ANNUAL REPORT,
19 WHICH CONTAINS RATE INFORMATION FOR THE YEARS 1993
20 THROUGH 1996, WILL BE DISTRIBUTED TO BOARD MEMBERS
21 AND MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC SHORTLY.
22 DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCE
23 CONTROL WILL HOLD A USED OIL HAULER WORKSHOP ON
24 MAY 14TH IN LOS ANGELES. THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS
25 MEETING IS TO MAKE HAULERS AWARE OF BOTH THE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 DEPARTMENT AND OUR BOARD REQUIREMENTS AND TO RAISE
2 THE LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE. OIL HAULERS ARE AN
3 IMPORTANT PART OF THE RECYCLING CLOSING THE LOOP
4 PROCESS.

5 THE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA HHW
6 INFORMATION EXCHANGE WILL BE HELD ON APRIL 9TH IN
7 SONOMA COUNTY, AND FOR THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
8 AREA, THE EXCHANGE WILL BE HELD ON APRIL 16TH IN
9 CHINO. AN AWARD OF THE FIFTH CYCLE USED OIL
10 RECYCLING BLOCK GRANTS AND OF USED OIL RESEARCH
11 AND DEMONSTRATION GRANTS WILL BE TAKEN TO THE
12 BOARD IN MAY.

13 UPDATE ON STATE PROJECT RECYCLE:
14 STAFF ASSISTED AND WERE ASKED TO COORDINATE THE
15 PICKUP AND SALE OF NEARLY 11 TONS OF SCRAP
16 ONE-HALF INCH DIAMETER COMPUTER CABLE WHICH HAD
17 BEEN REPLACED BY FIBEROPTIC CABLE AT THE TEALE
18 DATA CENTER IN SACRAMENTO. AND FOR THIS EFFORT,
19 THE BOARD RECEIVED A CHECK FOR \$3400 PAYABLE TO
20 THE PROJECT RECYCLE FUND.

21 STAFF ATTENDED AND FACILITATED
22 SESSIONS AT THE CALIFORNIA COLLEGIATE RECYCLING
23 COUNCIL CAMPUS RECYCLING WORKSHOP HELD AT LOYOLA
24 MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY IN LOS ANGELES ON MARCH 7TH.

25 STAFF IS WORKING WITH THE CUSTODIAL

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 SUPERVISOR AT THE STATE CAPITOL TO IMPROVE THEIR
2 IN-HOUSE RECYCLING PROGRAM. THIS INVOLVES THE
3 COLLECTION OF OLD AND DENTED RECYCLING CONTAINERS
4 AND REPLACING THEM WITH NEW CONTAINERS AND
5 PROVIDING ADDITIONAL IN-HOUSE TRAINING.

6 STAFF RECENTLY HANDLED AN UNUSUAL
7 AND INTERESTING SERVICE REQUEST. SMURFIT ASKED
8 STAFF TO FIND A HOME FOR 2300 POUNDS OF BANANA
9 PUREE THAT WAS STILL GOOD, BUT PAST ITS SHELF LIFE
10 FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION. THANKS TO REFERRAL FROM
11 STAFF, THERE ARE NOW SOME HAPPY HOGS AT STANDARD
12 FEEDING. THEY ARE ENJOYING SOME BANANA PUREE
13 THANKS TO ONE OF SMURFIT'S SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
14 CLIENTS, KNOTTS BERRY FARM. ANOTHER INTERESTING
15 EXCHANGE.

16 SO THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION.
17 ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

18 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THANK YOU FOR THAT
19 LAST ONE.

20 NEXT I WILL CALL, FOR AGENDA ITEM 2,
21 ON CAREN TRGOVCICH, REPRESENTING WASTE PREVENTION
22 AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT DIVISION.

23 MS. TRGOVCICH: GOOD MORNING, MR.
24 CHAIRMAN AND MEMBER. JUST A FEW ITEMS TO REPORT
25 FOR YOU THIS MORNING. AND TODAY IS A GRASSCYCLING

1 DAY. IF YOU WILL TUNE IN TONIGHT TO KBIE, CHANNEL
2 6, YOU WILL FIND THAT THERE WILL BE A LOCAL
3 BACKYARD COMPOSTING SHOW THAT IS BEING AIRED. THE
4 TAPING OCCURRED, I BELIEVE, LAST WEEK AT THE
5 CHANNEL 6 STUDIOS. IT SUPPORTS THE SACRAMENTO
6 COUNTY PUBLIC EDUCATION EFFORT, AND THE PROGRAM IS
7 HOSTED BY JACK GALLAGHER, THE CRYSTAL GUY. I'VE
8 NEVER SEEN HIM. I'M ASSUMING OTHER PEOPLE HAVE, A
9 COMEDIAN. AND IT DISCUSSES THE REASONS FOR
10 BACKYARD COMPOSTING, VERMICOMPOSTING,
11 GRASSCYCLING, HOW TO SUCCESSFULLY APPLY YARD WASTE
12 PREVENTION TECHNIQUES.

13 IT WILL BE ON IF YOU TUNE IN TONIGHT
14 BOTH AT 6:30 AND, I BELIEVE, AGAIN ON JUNE 4TH AT
15 6:30 AS WELL. SO IT WILL AIR TONIGHT, AND THEN
16 THERE WILL BE A SUBSEQUENT AIRING ON JUNE 4TH.

17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ARE WE GOING TO GET A
18 COPY OF THAT TAPE?

19 MS. TRGOVCICH: DEFINITELY. WE WILL GET
20 A COPY. AND I BELIEVE ACTUALLY THAT SOME OF THE
21 STAFF -- THERE WERE THREE STAFF PRESENT THERE AT
22 THE TAPING AS WELL, SO WE'LL GET COPIES. YOU
23 KNOW, IT MAY BE POSSIBLE -- I DON'T KNOW. I
24 BELIEVE THE LENGTH IS A HALF HOUR, BUT IT MAY BE
25 POSSIBLE TO SET UP A TIME IN THE BOARD ROOM TO

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 EVEN AIR IT AT ONE POINT.

2 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: GOING TO BE VERY
3 UNLIKELY TO BE ABLE TO SEE IT AT 6:30 IN THE
4 EVENING, BUT WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT ON VIDEO.

5 MS. TRGOVCICH: I'LL TRY TO SEE IF I CAN
6 MAKE MY VCR WORK. I HAVEN'T TRIED THAT IN A LONG
7 TIME.

8 ANYWAY, AND JUST CONTINUING WITH THE
9 THEME OF GRASSCYCLING, OUR YARD WASTE PREVENTION
10 STAFF ARE WORKING WITH THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF ON
11 A GRASSCYCLING EDUCATIONAL CAMPAIGN. THERE'S BEEN
12 A LOT OF MEDIA INTEREST IN THE TOPIC. MEMBER
13 FRAZEE, YOU APPEARED ON A 30-MINUTE T.V. PROGRAM
14 DEVOTED SOLELY TO GRASSCYCLING.

15 STAFF WAS ALSO INVITED TO APPEAR ON
16 A 30-MINUTE RADIO PROGRAM IN THE L.A. AREA. BOTH
17 OPPORTUNITIES WERE VERY SUCCESSFUL. THERE WERE
18 MANY ARTICLES ON GRASSCYCLING THAT APPEARED AS A
19 RESULT OF THOSE MEDIA EVENTS. AND IN ADDITION TO
20 THOSE EVENTS, WE'LL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE
21 INFORMATION ON THE SUCCESS OF THIS CAMPAIGN IN THE
22 COMING MONTHS AS WELL THROUGH OUR REPORTS. WE'LL
23 TRY TO CIRCULATE TO YOU COPIES OF THE ARTICLES. I
24 THINK IT'S A VERY EFFECTIVE CAMPAIGN AS IT
25 CONTINUES TO ROLL OUT AND MOVE ALONG. SO WE'VE

1 SEEN A LOT THERE.

2 THE GRASSCYCLING POSTER, AS YOU

3 KNOW, WE DISTRIBUTED A LARGE QUANTITY OF POSTERS

4 TO ALL -- A NUMBER OF STORES THROUGHOUT

5 CALIFORNIA. AS YOU ARE AWARE, ALL THE WAL-MART

6 STORES HAVE PARTICIPATED IN PLACING THAT POSTER IN

7 THEIR STORES TO BE ABLE TO GET INTEREST INTO THE

8 GRASSCYCLING TECHNIQUE. WE HAVE RECEIVED

9 INQUIRIES NOW FROM WAL-MART STORES OUTSIDE OF

10 CALIFORNIA; IN FACT, WISCONSIN, TO BE EXACT. AND

11 SO WE'RE SEEING AN INTEREST IN OUR APPROACH, OUR

12 CAMPAIGN HERE IN CALIFORNIA, AND WE'RE SENDING OUT

13 THAT INFORMATION, THOSE MEDIA SUPPORT MATERIALS,

14 TO THOSE OTHER STORES AS WELL.

15 WE'VE ALSO CONTACTED THE STATE OF

16 WISCONSIN TO LET THEM KNOW OF THE INTEREST IN THE

17 CAMPAIGN AND THE POSTER, SO HOPEFULLY THEY CAN

18 HELP BUILD ON THOSE EFFORTS AS WELL. SO THAT'S A

19 VERY POSITIVE DEVELOPMENT AS WE CONTINUE TO ROLL

20 OUT THIS CAMPAIGN.

21 WE ARE CONTINUING TO WORK WITH BOTH

22 THE CITIES OF NAPA AND LOS ANGELES TO ESTABLISH

23 GRASSCYCLING PROGRAMS, ONCE AGAIN IN KEEPING WITH

24 THE THEME, OUR SPRING THEME, IF YOU WANT TO CALL

25 IT THAT. WE ARE DEVELOPING PUBLIC/PRIVATE

1 PARTNERSHIPS WITH INFORMATION BEING SUPPLIED
2 ANTICIPATING THE START-UP OF PROGRAMS IN NAPA THIS
3 SPRING. BOARD MEMBER JONES ALSO MET WITH THE CITY
4 OF LOS ANGELES AND STAFF A COUPLE OF WEEKS AGO TO
5 DISCUSS OPTIONS FOR PROVIDING MULCHING MOWERS TO
6 CITY RESIDENTS.

7 EVEN THOUGH THE CITY OF L.A. IS
8 CONSIDERING THIS A PILOT EFFORT, I BELIEVE THE
9 PILOT ITSELF IS TARGETING 5,000 INDIVIDUALS
10 THROUGH THE COMPOST TRAINING THAT THEY WILL BE
11 OFFERING AND THEN A PILOT EFFORT AROUND THE
12 MULCHING MOWERS ITSELF; SO ALTHOUGH IT'S PILOT,
13 IT'S PRETTY SIGNIFICANT IN SCOPE.

14 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ARE THEY LINKING UP IN
15 THAT PROJECT LIKE THEY ARE HERE LOCALLY WITH THE
16 AIR QUALITY ISSUE AND MARKETING ELECTRIC MOWERS?

17 MS. TRGOVCICH: I BELIEVE THAT'S ONE OF
18 THE REASONS WHY THEY'RE PURSUING THAT DOWN IN THE
19 LOS ANGELES AREA. I DON'T KNOW THAT THEY'RE
20 LINKING UP WITH THE SOUTH COAST DISTRICT ON THAT
21 FRONT, AND I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THE CAMPAIGN WILL
22 BE TARGETED AT ELECTRIC MOWERS. I THINK THAT IT'S
23 GOING TO BE TARGETED AT GRASSCYCLING. PERHAPS
24 THEY CAN ENGENDER SOME INTEREST.

25 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ARE WE INVOLVED IN THE

1 ONE HERE IN SACRAMENTO BECAUSE I NOTED IN THE
2 PUBLICITY THAT IT WAS BOTH MULCHING MOWERS AND
3 ELECTRIC POWERED MOWERS, AND THEY WERE COMBINING
4 THE AIR QUALITY ISSUE WITH THE WASTE ISSUE?

5 MS. TRGOVCICH: I THINK IT WAS
6 PRINCIPALLY ELECTRIC POWER THAT THEY WERE
7 DISTRIBUTING THAT WERE MULCHING MOWERS. WE SENT A
8 LETTER OF SUPPORT TO THE AIR DISTRICT, SAYING, YOU
9 KNOW, WE CERTAINLY WANT TO SUPPORT YOU. THEY
10 REQUESTED OUR PARTICIPATION. I THINK THEY WERE
11 LOOKING FOR MONEY MORE THAN ANYTHING. WE COULDN'T
12 EXACTLY HELP THEM OUT THAT IN ARENA. SO WE
13 HAVEN'T BEEN AN INTEGRAL PART TO THIS CAMPAIGN,
14 BUT WE'VE BEEN SENDING PEOPLE OUT TO SEE HOW IT
15 PROGRESSES, AND WE'LL BE PLANNING ON FOLLOWING UP
16 WITH THE DISTRICT TO SEE IF THERE IS ADDITIONAL
17 ASSISTANCE THAT WE CAN PROVIDE.

18 I BELIEVE THEY HELD ANOTHER DAY OUT
19 AT CAL. EXPO THIS WEEKEND AS WELL. SO THEY HAVE
20 BEEN GETTING A LOT OF SUCCESS AND A LOT OF MEDIA
21 TIME FROM THAT EFFORT.

22 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WHETHER WE WERE
23 ACTIVELY SEEKING IT OR NOT, THE FOCUS ON MULCHING
24 MOWERS GOT QUITE A BIT OF ATTENTION IN THE
25 PROCESS. IT WASN'T JUST THE AIR QUALITY ISSUE,

1 BUT BOTH OF THEM WERE HIGHLIGHTED.

2 MS. TRGOVCICH: RIGHT. ONCE AGAIN THE
3 SPRING THEME, WE'VE BEEN WORKING WITH THE NORTHERN
4 SIERRA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT TO OBTAIN
5 FUNDS FOR ADDRESSING AIR POLLUTION CAUSED BY THE
6 BURNING OF YARD WASTE. SO ONCE AGAIN, WE'RE
7 TRYING TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO THE LOCALS IN
8 BEING ABLE TO HELP THEM IDENTIFY FUNDING SOURCES
9 AND OPPORTUNITIES TO BE ABLE TO GET SUPPORT AT THE
10 LOCAL LEVEL.

11 BASED UPON THE ASSISTANCE THAT WE
12 PROVIDED, ROD HILL, REPRESENTING THE DISTRICT, HAS
13 SUBMITTED TWO GRANT APPLICATIONS TO THE U.S. EPA.
14 WE FEEL THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THEM WILL BE
15 SUCCESSFUL. THEY'RE LOOKING AT, ONCE AGAIN,
16 ADDRESSING THE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE
17 BURNING OF YARD WASTE. ONE OF THE APPLICATIONS,
18 IF FUNDED, WOULD PROVIDE FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION ON
19 THE BENEFITS OF USING COMPOST AS THE FIRST PHASE
20 OF THEIR EFFORT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL.

21 THE SECOND EFFORT OR THE SECOND
22 PHASE WOULD PROVIDE FOR A YARD WASTE DROP-OFF SITE
23 FOR NEVADA COUNTY RESIDENTS WHERE THE MATERIAL
24 WILL BE CHIPPED AND SHREDDED BEFORE BEING USED
25 LOCALLY.

1 THE SECOND APPLICATION THAT WAS
2 SUBMITTED WOULD ADDRESS RESIDENTIAL YARD WASTE
3 RECYCLING EDUCATION AND MAY INCLUDE TRAINING OF
4 MASTER COMPOSTERS AS WELL. SO WE'RE SEEING A LOT
5 OF EFFORT IN THAT ARENA.

6 I WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW AS WELL
7 THAT WE WILL BE SUBMITTING A GRANT APPLICATION --
8 I BELIEVE THE DEADLINE IS NEXT FRIDAY -- TO U.S.
9 EPA UNDER THEIR PPIS PROGRAM, THE POLLUTION
10 PREVENTION INCENTIVE GRANTS. WE'RE SUBMITTING AN
11 APPLICATION FOR AN INTEGRATED WASTE AUDIT
12 FUNCTION. THIS IS A CONTINUATION OF THE WASTE
13 AUDIT FUNCTION THAT WE'VE BEEN PERFORMING OVER
14 PRIOR YEARS.

15 THE PPIS PROGRAM, AS YOU ARE AWARE,
16 REQUIRES PARTNERS TO GO IN WITH US ON THE
17 APPLICATION PROCESS, AND OUR PARTNERS IN THIS
18 GRANT SOLICITATION ARE THE CITIES OF NAPA OR
19 COUNTIES OF NAPA, ALAMEDA, CONTRA COSTA, AND ABAG
20 AS WELL, THE ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS.
21 SO WE'RE SEEING A REALLY GOOD PARTNERSHIP BEING
22 DEVELOPED THAT WE HOPE WILL CONTINUE BEYOND JUST
23 THIS EFFORT AROUND THE PPIS GRANTS AND, IN FACT,
24 HAS BEEN BORN OUT OF THE LOCAL EFFORTS IN THAT
25 REGARD AS WELL.

1 AND LASTLY, JUST TO LET YOU KNOW
2 THAT THE SECTION 100 CHANGES REGARDING THE FOOD
3 AND COSMETIC CONTAINERS AND THE RPPC REGULATIONS
4 WERE APPROVED BY THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
5 ON MARCH 31ST, SO THOSE CHANGES ARE NOW IN EFFECT
6 OR WILL BE IN EFFECT AFTER 30 DAYS. WE WILL BE
7 MAKING SURE THAT OUR COPIES OF THE REGULATIONS
8 THAT GO OUT, ETC., ARE CHANGED TO REFLECT THOSE --
9 THAT APPROVAL. AND THAT CONCLUDES MY REPORT.

10 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY
11 MUCH. ANY QUESTIONS?

12 OKAY. THE NEXT ITEM IS AGENDA ITEM
13 3, WHICH IS CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS.
14 THE CONSENT AGENDA -- INCIDENTALLY, THERE'S COPIES
15 AVAILABLE ON THE BACK TABLE IF ANYBODY IS CURIOUS
16 WHAT THEY ARE. AND ANY OF THESE ITEMS CAN BE
17 PULLED OFF BY THE COMMITTEE AT THE REQUEST OF
18 EITHER A COMMITTEE MEMBER OR MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC.

19 THOSE ITEMS ARE 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10,
20 11, 12, AND 13. AND I'D LIKE TO NOTE THAT 11 AND
21 12 REPRESENT THE COMPLETION OF THE INTEGRATED
22 WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE
23 COUNTIES -- COUNTY AND CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND
24 FOR SOLANO COUNTY, WHICH MEANS THAT WE'VE GOT TWO
25 MORE IN THE BAG, IF YOU WILL, IN TERMS OF THE

1 WHOLE PROCESS, TWO MORE COUNTIES THAT HAVE
2 COMPLETED THAT PROCESS, AND SO THEY'RE TO BE
3 COMMEDED. AND IT'S ANOTHER SIGN OF PROGRESS IN
4 OUR EFFORTS HERE.

5 SO IS THERE A MOTION?

6 MEMBER FRAZEE: MOVE CONSENT CALENDAR.

7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: AND PLACE THAT ON THE
8 BOARD CONSENT AGENDA. I WILL SECOND THAT.

9 CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE.

10 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE.

11 MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.

12 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN CHESBRO.

13 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: AYE. MOTION CARRIES.

14 WE WILL PROCEED TO ITEM 7, WHICH IS
15 CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE
16 TWO-YEAR TIME EXTENSION FOR MEETING THE DIVERSION
17 REQUIREMENTS OF THE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT
18 ACT FOR THE CITY OF GREENFIELD IN MONTEREY COUNTY.

19 AND BEFORE THE STAFF PRESENTATION IS
20 MADE, I'D LIKE TO SAY THAT WE TALKED DURING THE
21 GETTING TO 50 PERCENT DISCUSSION, AND WE WILL
22 PROBABLY BE PINNING MORE SPECIFICS IN THE FUTURE
23 ABOUT TRYING TO SIMPLIFY THE PROCESS OF GRANTING
24 FLEXIBILITY OPTIONS TO RURAL COUNTIES AND SMALL
25 CITIES.

1 AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I WOULD
2 SUGGEST, IF THERE'S CONCURRENCE FROM MY FELLOW
3 COMMITTEE MEMBER, IS THAT ONE WAY OF DOING THAT
4 WOULD BE TO IN THE FUTURE PLACE THESE ITEMS ON THE
5 COMMITTEE'S CONSENT CALENDAR UNLESS THERE'S AN
6 ISSUE THAT STAFF HAS A CONCERN WITH OR UNLESS THE
7 JURISDICTION WANTS TO COME AND TALK TO US. AGAIN,
8 JUST TO MAKE IT AS STANDARDIZED AND AS SIMPLE AS
9 POSSIBLE SO THAT WE'RE SENDING THE MESSAGE THAT
10 THE RURAL, SMALL JURISDICTIONS, MAKING IT AS EASY
11 AS POSSIBLE FOR THEM TO GET THOSE FLEXIBILITY
12 OPTIONS.

13 THAT BEING SAID, JUDY.

14 MS. FRIEDMAN: TABETHA WILLMON WITH THE
15 OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE WILL MAKE THE
16 PRESENTATION FOR STAFF.

17 MS. WILLMON: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
18 CHESBRO, COMMITTEE MEMBER. I AM TABETHA WILLMON
19 FROM THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE. I'M
20 PRESENTING ITEM NO. 7, WHICH IS THE PETITION FOR
21 EXTENSION IN THE 1995 DIVERSION GOAL. IT'S A
22 TWO-YEAR EXTENSION FOR THE CITY OF GREENFIELD,
23 WHICH IS IN MONTEREY COUNTY.

24 THIS ITEM IS A STAFF RECOMMENDATION
25 FOR THE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER THE CITY OF

1 GREENFIELD'S TWO-YEAR EXTENSION IN MEETING THE '95
2 GOAL. ACCEPTANCE OF THIS RECOMMENDATION WOULD
3 EXTEND THE GOAL YEAR FOR THE CITY OF GREENFIELD TO
4 MEET THEIR '95 DIVERSION RATE FROM 1995 UNTIL
5 1997, SO THEIR GOAL YEAR WOULD BE 1997.

6 GREENFIELD MEETS THE RURAL CRITERIA
7 AND QUALIFIES TO PETITION FOR THE EXTENSION. THEY
8 HAVE AN AREA OF A LITTLE LESS THAN 1.2 SQUARE
9 MILES, AND THEIR WASTE GENERATION RATE IS ABOUT
10 10.6 TONS PER DAY. GREENFIELD CONTRIBUTES
11 APPROXIMATELY .005 OF THE STATE'S WASTESTREAM, SO
12 IT'S PRETTY SMALL.

13 THE CITY PLANS TO MEET 25.9 PERCENT
14 DIVERSION RATE BY THE END OF 1997 THROUGH
15 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMS:
16 BUY-BACK AND DROP-OFF CENTERS, GOVERNMENTAL WASTE
17 REDUCTION AND RECYCLING PROGRAMS, SCHOOL RECYCLING
18 PROGRAMS, A PUBLIC OUTREACH PROGRAM IN BOTH
19 ENGLISH AND SPANISH, AND SINGLE-FAMILY CURBSIDE
20 RECYCLING.

21 THE REASONS THAT GREENFIELD IS
22 REQUESTING AN EXTENSION ARE THE FOLLOWING:
23 LIMITED REVENUES, LIMITED CITY STAFF, STRICT
24 LIMITATIONS ON OPTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL FEES DUE TO
25 A SMALL POPULATION AND ECONOMIC BASE OF THE CITY,

1 LIMITED COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL BUSINESSES WITH
2 CORRESPONDING WASTE VOLUMES, UNDEVELOPED MARKETS
3 IN THE REGION, AND FISCAL IMPACTS OF STATE
4 MANDATED PROGRAMS.

5 BOARD STAFF HAVE REVIEWED THE
6 PETITION FOR EXTENSION, AND IT COMPLIES WITH THE
7 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS. STAFF BELIEVE THAT THE
8 TWO-YEAR EXTENSION FOR 1995 REQUIREMENT IS
9 JUSTIFIED AND RECOMMEND THAT THE COMMITTEE
10 CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE CITY OF GREENFIELD'S
11 PETITION.

12 THE -- UNFORTUNATELY, THE CITY'S
13 PLANNING STAFF PERSON RECENTLY RESIGNED, AND THE
14 CITY MANAGER WASN'T ABLE TO MAKE IT. SO I'LL BE
15 HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS IF YOU HAVE ANY.

16 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ANY QUESTIONS?

17 MEMBER FRAZEE: JUST ON THE GENERAL
18 SUBJECT OF THESE EXTENSIONS. IT'S ALSO POSSIBLE
19 FOR AN EXTENSION OR A REDUCTION IN THE GOAL.
20 IS -- THAT'S ANOTHER OPTION?

21 MS. WILLMON: FOR THE YEAR 2000 I BELIEVE
22 THE COMMITTEE BACK IN OCTOBER ADOPTED A POLICY NOT
23 TO GRANT RETROACTIVE PETITIONS FOR 1995. SO THIS
24 WAS THE DIRECTION THE COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD
25 FOCUSED ON WAS THE TWO-YEAR EXTENSIONS SINCE '95

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 IS ALREADY PAST.

2 MEMBER FRAZEE: RATHER THAN THE REDUCTION
3 OF THE GOAL ITSELF.

4 MS. WILLMON: YEAH, FOR '95. THEY CAN
5 STILL PETITION FOR 2000 REDUCTION.

6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I SHOULD PROBABLY BE A
7 LITTLE MORE PRECISE ABOUT MY EARLIER COMMENTS
8 ABOUT -- SO STAFF UNDERSTANDS EXACTLY WHAT I MEANT
9 ABOUT CONSENT. I'M TALKING ABOUT FOR THOSE
10 JURISDICTIONS WHO ARE QUALIFIED FOR RURAL OR SMALL
11 COMMUNITY PETITIONS FOR REDUCTION AND PETITIONS
12 FOR EXTENSION, AND ONLY FOR THOSE THAT STAFF HAS A
13 POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION ON. THOSE WOULD BE THE
14 ONES I'M TALKING ABOUT GOING ON CONSENT.

15 THE MOTION WOULD BE TO ACCEPT STAFF
16 RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE A TWO-YEAR EXTENSION
17 FOR THE '95 DIVERSION REQUIREMENT FOR THE CITY OF
18 GREENFIELD AND FORWARD THAT TO THE BOARD'S
19 CONSENT.

20 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO MOVED.

21 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: BEEN MOVED AND
22 SECONDED. WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL CALL.
23 MOTION PASSES TWO ZERO. THANK YOU.

24 ITEM 14 IS A LONG AWAITED ITEM, BUT
25 I THINK A VERY, VERY IMPORTANT ONE, CONSIDERATION

1 OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING ENFORCEMENT
2 OPTIONS FOR JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE FAILED TO FILE
3 ADEQUATE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENTS
4 AND/OR NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENTS, INCLUDING
5 COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES, PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES,
6 AND CRITERIA FOR PENALTIES.

7 MS. FRIEDMAN: YES. LLOYD DILLON, SOUTH
8 SECTION SUPERVISOR WITH THE OFFICE OF LOCAL
9 ASSISTANCE, AND ELLIOT BLOCK, STAFF COUNSEL, WILL
10 BE MAKING THE PRESENTATION FOR STAFF.

11 MR. DILLON: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
12 CHESBRO AND MEMBER FRAZEE. I'M GLAD TO BE HERE
13 AGAIN ON THIS ITEM BEFORE YOU. IT'S A RECURRING
14 EVENT ON THIS.

15 IN MARCH 1996 THE COMMITTEE ACCEPTED
16 AND THE BOARD ACCEPTED STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION FOR
17 A STEPWISE APPROACH TO ENFORCEMENT OPTIONS
18 REGARDING THE JURISDICTIONS THAT HAD NOT SUBMITTED
19 THEIR SRRE'S AND NDFE'S.

20 STAFF HAS BEEN WORKING ON THAT
21 STEPWISE APPROACH ADOPTED BY THE BOARD AND SENT
22 LETTERS TO JURISDICTIONS IN MARCH OF '96, JANUARY
23 OF '97, AND MARCH OF '97. AND IN THE MARCH '97
24 LETTER, WE ALSO CONTAINED A COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE
25 FORM THAT WE ASKED THAT THE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS

1 RETURN COMPLETED AND SIGNED.

2 STAFF ENDEAVORED TO CONTACT THOSE
3 JURISDICTIONS THAT DID NOT IMMEDIATELY RESPOND TO
4 THE LETTER. AND AS IT ENDED UP, EVERY NON-
5 COMPLYING JURISDICTION HAS NOW SUBMITTED EITHER AN
6 ELEMENT, THE SIGNED DOCUMENTATION TO MAKE THE
7 PREVIOUS SUBMITTAL COMPLETE, OR A COMPLIANCE
8 SCHEDULE.

9 STAFF HAS COMPILED THE RETURNED
10 COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES INTO TWO CATEGORIES, LESS
11 THAN 120 DAYS AND GREATER THAN 120 DAYS, AND THOSE
12 ARE SUMMARIZED ON ATTACHMENTS 2 AND 3 WITHIN THE
13 AGENDA PACKET.

14 ALSO IN THE AGENDA PACKET, STAFF HAS
15 INCLUDED A TABLE INDICATING THOSE LOCAL JURISDIC-
16 TIONS WHICH SUBMITTED THEIR ELEMENTS OR REQUIRED
17 DOCUMENTATION TO ALLOW STAFF TO PROCEED WITH ITS
18 REVIEW OF THE ELEMENT.

19 STAFF WILL CONTINUE TO MONITOR THE
20 PROGRESS OF THOSE JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE NOT
21 SUBMITTED THEIR ELEMENTS OR DOCUMENTATION TO THE
22 BOARD FOR CONSIDERATION.

23 THE LIST OF COMPLIANCE CAN
24 CONSTANTLY CHANGE AS JURISDICTIONS SUBMIT
25 DOCUMENTS OR DOCUMENTATION OR WITH ELEMENT

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 WITHDRAWALS OR DELAYS AS THE JURISDICTIONS WORK ON
2 THEIR DOCUMENTS. ATTACHMENT 2, PAGE 82 IN YOUR
3 AGENDA PACKET, SUMMARIZES THE JURISDICTIONS WITH
4 COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES WITHIN THE PREFERRED 120 DAYS
5 TIME LINE. THERE ARE 22 JURISDICTIONS AND 29
6 ELEMENTS ON THAT LIST. THESE SCHEDULES INDICATE
7 EITHER THE ELEMENTS OR THE MISSING DOCUMENTATION
8 FILED WITH THE BOARD BY THE END OF JULY.

9 ATTACHMENT 3, PAGE 84 OF THE AGENDA
10 PACKET, SUMMARIZES THE JURISDICTIONS WITH
11 COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES EXCEEDING THE 120 DAYS TIME
12 LINE. THERE ARE 20 JURISDICTIONS REPRESENTING 51
13 ELEMENTS ON THIS LIST. STAFF HAS DETERMINED THAT
14 THESE ARE WITHIN REASON AND ARE ACCEPTABLE. THESE
15 SCHEDULES INDICATE EITHER THE ELEMENTS OR THE
16 MISSING DOCUMENTATION WILL BE FILED WITH THE BOARD
17 BY THE END OF SEPTEMBER.

18 ATTACHMENT 5, PAGE 85 OF THE AGENDA
19 PACKET, SUMMARIZES THE JURISDICTIONS THAT DID NOT
20 FILE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES. AND AS YOU CAN SEE,
21 THERE ARE NONE LISTED. THEY ALL FILED SOMETHING.
22 EVERY JURISDICTION LISTED IN THE MARCH '97 AGENDA
23 PACKET FILED SOMETHING FOR US. WE INCLUDED THIS
24 TO ILLUSTRATE THAT THE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS HAVE
25 RESPONDED IN SOME MANNER TO THE BOARD'S DIRECTIVE.

1 ATTACHMENT 5, PAGE 86 OF THE AGENDA
2 PACKET, SUMMARIZES THOSE JURISDICTIONS WHICH HAVE
3 FILED THEIR MISSING ELEMENTS OR THE MISSING
4 DOCUMENTATION NEEDED TO MAKE A PREVIOUSLY FILED
5 ELEMENT COMPLETE. OF THE ORIGINAL 66 LISTED
6 JURISDICTIONS, THERE ARE 22 JURISDICTIONS AND 27
7 ELEMENTS ON THIS LIST. STAFF IS PROCESSING THESE
8 ELEMENTS AND DOCUMENTS IN ITS NORMAL FASHION AND
9 IS EXPECTED TO BRING THE ELEMENTS BEFORE THE
10 COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION WITHIN THE NEXT THREE
11 MONTHS.

12 IF STAFF'S MONITORING OF THE STATUS
13 OF THE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES INDICATES THE
14 JURISDICTION IS NOT PROGRESSING POSITIVELY, STAFF
15 WOULD CONSIDER EXERCISING THIS OPTION, TO CONSIDER
16 HOLDING ENFORCEMENT HEARINGS TO NOTICE THE BOARD'S
17 HEARING TO CONSIDER THE LOCAL JURISDICTION'S
18 EFFORTS AND POSSIBLE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION.

19 THIS PROCEDURE INCLUDES INVITING THE
20 LOCAL JURISDICTION TO COME BEFORE YOU TO EXPLAIN
21 THE REASONS FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THEIR
22 COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE. AND MR. BLOCK WILL DISCUSS
23 THIS IN MORE DETAIL IN A MOMENT.

24 STAFF WILL CONTINUE TO MONITOR THOSE
25 JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE NOT SUBMITTED THEIR

1 ELEMENTS OR DOCUMENTATION TO THE BOARD FOR
2 CONSIDERATION. STAFF WILL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE
3 STATUS REPORTS AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS THROUGH JUDY,
4 THE DIVISION OF PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE
5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR. STAFF WILL PROVIDE SPECIFIC
6 UPDATES AT THE COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR CONSIDERA-
7 TION.

8 OF THE JURISDICTIONS LISTED ON THE
9 ATTACHMENT 2 AND 3, FOUR JURISDICTIONS HAVE NOT
10 RESPONDED LIKE THE OTHERS. THESE ARE UNION CITY
11 IN ALAMEDA COUNTY AND THE CITY OF WILLIAMS, THE
12 CITY OF COLUSA, AND COLUSA COUNTY, ALL WITHIN
13 COLUSA COUNTY.

14 UNION CITY HAS BEEN INFORMED ABOUT
15 THE INADEQUACY OF THEIR PREVIOUS DOCUMENTATION
16 FILINGS. DURING OUR ATTEMPTS TO GET COMPLIANCE
17 SCHEDULES FILED, WE'VE BEEN ASSURED BY THEIR
18 ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER THAT THE MISSING
19 DOCUMENTATION WILL BE HERE THE FIRST WEEK OF
20 APRIL.

21 UNION CITY HAS RECENTLY SUBMITTED
22 DOCUMENTATION TO STAFF REGARDING THE LOCAL
23 ADOPTION OF THE FINAL SRRE AND THE FINAL NDFE.
24 STAFF IS EVALUATING THIS RECENT INFORMATION AND
25 WOULD HOPE TO HAVE A DETERMINATION ABOUT ITS

1 ADEQUACY AND COMPLETENESS BY THE BOARD MEETING.
2 STAFF WILL BE WORKING WITH THE CITY TO RESOLVE
3 THIS MATTER.

4 COLUSA COUNTY AND THE CITY OF COLUSA
5 AND THE CITY OF WILLIAMS, COLUSA COUNTY SUBMITTED
6 A COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE THAT EXTENDS INTO FEBRUARY
7 OF 1998. MR. RICHARD DICKSON, THE COUNTY'S
8 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE ANALYST, IS HERE TODAY TO
9 EXPLAIN THE PROPOSED SCHEDULE, INCLUDING NEW
10 INFORMATION THAT HE WILL BRING TO YOU.

11 WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO TURN IT OVER
12 TO MR. DICKSON IF HE'D LIKE TO MAKE THAT
13 PRESENTATION AT THIS TIME.

14 MR. DICKSON: MORNING, CHAIRMAN CHESBRO,
15 COMMITTEE MEMBER. WE SUBMITTED ON APRIL 16TH OUR
16 COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE AND REALIZE THE TIME FRAMES
17 ARE SOMEWHAT STRETCHED OUT. PART OF THE SITUATION
18 WITH US ON OUR COMPLIANCE TIME FRAMES IS THE
19 PROCESS THAT WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH FOR OUR CEQA
20 HEARINGS AND THROUGH OUR PLANNING COMMISSION. AND
21 I BROUGHT WITH ME THE SCHEDULE SO THAT I CAN KIND
22 OF GIVE YOU AN IDEA OF WHERE WE'RE AT.

23 IN PROPOSING THE TIME FRAMES, WE HAD
24 CALCULATED THAT WE WOULD BE DONE IN SEPTEMBER WITH
25 OUR SRRE. AND IF WE DO THAT, WE WOULD BE ABLE TO

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 SUBMIT TO OUR PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE PLANNING
2 DEPARTMENT, OUR DOCUMENTATION WOULD GO IN ON THE
3 10TH OF OCTOBER -- BE ON THE 6TH OF OCTOBER. AND
4 PART OF THE PROBLEM IS THAT OUR PLANNING
5 COMMISSION MEETS ONCE A MONTH. THE TECHNICAL
6 ADVISORY COMMITTEE, WHICH IS THE ADVISORY
7 COMMITTEE FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION, MEETS ONCE
8 A MONTH. AND THIS TIME FRAME ALSO ALLOWS FOR THE
9 DEPARTMENT TO MAKE COMMENTS AND FOR OUR PACKAGE TO
10 GO OUT TO BE REVIEWED BY LOCAL AGENCIES. THAT
11 TIME FRAME IS ABOUT THREE MONTHS LONG.

12 PART OF THAT PROCESS IS THAT WE'RE
13 REQUIRED IN OUR PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS TO POST
14 NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING 21 DAYS PRIOR TO. WE
15 WOULD HOPE THAT WE MAY BE ABLE TO GET IN THE
16 DECEMBER ONE; BUT IN TALKING TO THE PLANNING
17 DEPARTMENT, THE 21-DAY POSTING PERIOD WOULD SHOVE
18 US INTO THE JANUARY MEETING. AND FROM THAT TIME
19 FRAME, THEN I WOULD HAVE TO TAKE IT BACK TO THE
20 TWO CITY COUNCILS AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR
21 APPROVAL.

22 OUR TASK FORCE IS THE AUTHOR OF OUR
23 DOCUMENT, AND I'VE GOT SEVEN PEOPLE WHO KNOW VERY
24 LITTLE ABOUT SOLID WASTE WHO ARE REVIEWING THIS
25 DOCUMENT. IT'S A VERY SLOW PROCESS. BUT I THINK

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 THE SEPTEMBER DATE ON COMPLETION AND HAVING THE
2 TASK FORCE COMMENTS WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT WE CAN
3 ACCOMPLISH.

4 THEN IT'S JUST A MATTER OF GETTING
5 IT THROUGH OUR PLANNING COMMISSION AND HAVING IT
6 REVIEWED BY THE GOVERNMENT BODIES. THAT'S WHY THE
7 DATES ARE CLEAR INTO '98.

8 ONE THING ABOUT THAT IS THAT DURING
9 THE PROCESS WHEN THE SRRE IS BEING HEARD, WE'LL BE
10 WORKING ON THE NDFE. IF YOU LOOK AT THE
11 COMPLIANCE DATES FOR THE OTHER DOCUMENTS, THEY'RE
12 RIGHT IN BEHIND THE SRRE. SO THOSE THINGS WILL BE
13 COMING IN FAIRLY RAPIDLY ONCE WE GET THE SRRE
14 DONE.

15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. WELL, I'VE GOT
16 A COUPLE OF RESPONSES. ONE OF THEM IS THAT WE'RE
17 NOW ABOUT FIVE YEARS PAST THE ORIGINAL DATE. AND
18 THE APPROACH THAT THE LEGISLATURE TOOK WAS TO
19 EXTEND THOSE DATES, AND THE APPROACH THIS BOARD
20 HAS TAKEN HAS BEEN TO TRY IN EVERY WAY POSSIBLE TO
21 BE RESPONSIVE TO THE KINDS OF PROBLEMS THAT YOU'RE
22 PRESENTING TO US AND SPEND BASICALLY YEARS DRAWING
23 OUT THE PROCESS TO GIVE PEOPLE THE OPPORTUNITY TO
24 RESPOND BASED ON THEIR LOCAL NEEDS AND PROBLEMS.

25 AND THAT'S NOW -- YOU KNOW, WE'RE

1 NOW IN 1997, AND WE'RE STILL IN THE PROCESS WHERE
2 WE'RE SAYING WE'RE NOT GOING TO GET ANYONE. WE'RE
3 SAYING GIVE US A COMPLIANCE DOCUMENT, YOU KNOW.
4 AND WITH THE SUBMITTAL OF THE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES
5 BY THE OTHER JURISDICTIONS, WE ARE NOW TO THE
6 POINT WHERE -- HOW MANY, 527 -- HOW MANY
7 JURISDICTIONS ALTOGETHER?

8 MR. DILLON: 531.

9 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: 531. SO 528
10 JURISDICTIONS IN THE STATE HAVE SAID THAT BY
11 ESSENTIALLY, I THINK, AUGUST THEY'RE GOING -- THEY
12 ARE GOING TO HAVE THE DOCUMENTS BEFORE US. AND
13 GIVEN THE AMOUNT OF TIME AND FLEXIBILITY WE'VE
14 ALREADY EXPENDED, TOGETHER WITH THAT LEVEL OF
15 COMING FORTH WITH THE DOCUMENTS, IT'S HARD FOR ME
16 TO COME UP WITH A JUSTIFICATION WHICH SAYS, WELL,
17 SOMEHOW THESE THREE OVER HERE ARE DIFFERENT.

18 I KNOW FOR A FACT THAT MANY, MANY
19 JURISDICTIONS IN THE STATE HAVE FACED SIMILAR
20 KINDS OF PROBLEMS IN TERMS OF VOLUNTEERS, LOCAL
21 COMMITTEES AND COMMISSION SCHEDULES, AGENDA NOTICE
22 PROCEDURES, ALL THOSE KINDS OF THINGS. AND I
23 THINK WHAT WE'RE FACED WITH NOW IS THAT SOONER OR
24 LATER THE BOARD HAS TO COUNTERBALANCE ITS
25 FLEXIBILITY WITH A STATEMENT THAT SAYS THERE'S AN

1 END TO THE PLANNING PROCESS OUT THERE, AND WE'RE
2 GOING TO MOVE ON TO OTHER THINGS.

3 AND SO IT'S HARD FOR ME, IN SPITE OF
4 THE FACT THAT I UNDERSTAND THAT THE PROBLEMS
5 YOU'RE PUTTING FORTH ARE REAL, I'M NOT DOUBTING
6 THEM AT ALL, IT'S HARD FOR ME TO SOMEHOW CREATE
7 WHAT'S DIFFERENT BETWEEN COLUSA AND THESE TWO
8 CITIES AND 528 JURISDICTIONS, YOU KNOW.

9 MR. DICKSON: WELL, IRREGARDLESS OF THAT
10 SITUATION, I AM THE STAFF PERSON FOR THOSE THREE
11 JURISDICTIONS. IN THE LAST THREE YEARS THAT I'VE
12 TAKEN THIS POSITION, WE'VE TRIED TO GET OUR SOLID
13 WASTE SITUATION UP TO SNUFF. I THINK IT WOULD BE
14 GREAT AS A SOLE PERSON IN THE STAFF IF I COULD
15 WORK ON THIS DOCUMENT ONLY, BUT I'M UNDER NOTICE
16 AND ORDERS TO COMPLY WITH DATES FROM PERMITTING
17 ALMOST ALL MY SOLID WASTE FACILITIES UP TO SNUFF
18 ON PERMITS. AND I'VE BEEN REQUIRED TO PRIORITIZE
19 WHAT I AM TO WORK ON.

20 AND RIGHT NOW THE PRIORITIES ARE TO
21 PERMIT THE NEW TRANSFER STATION SO THAT WE CAN
22 HANDLE OUR SOLID WASTE IN SOME TYPE OF REASONABLE
23 MANNER. I'M WRITING A PRELIMINARY CLOSURE PLAN
24 FOR ANOTHER ONE OF OUR FACILITIES SO WE CAN GET
25 THAT FACILITY PERMITTED. FIVE YEARS FOR THE SRRE,

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 I'M TALKING ABOUT 15 YEARS FOR PERMITS. I THINK
2 THOSE RIGHT NOW FOR US ARE A MUCH HIGHER PRIORITY
3 THAN THE SRRE. IT'S NOT LIKE WE HAVEN'T
4 IMPLEMENTED PROGRAMS. WE'VE IMPLEMENTED CURBSIDE
5 IN TWO OF THE JURISDICTIONS. OUR WASTE GENERATION
6 RATES ARE LOW. IT'S JUST BEEN A MATTER OF
7 PRIORITIES.

8 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: DO YOU HAVE ANY
9 COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS? OKAY. THANKS, RICHARD.
10 ELLIOT.

11 BEFORE WE GO ANY FURTHER, I HAD
12 INTENDED EARLY ON TO COMPLIMENT STAFF WITH THE
13 FACT THAT, YOU KNOW, THERE'S A NUMBER OF
14 JURISDICTIONS IN THIS STATE THAT ARE VERY SMALL,
15 DON'T HAVE A LOT OF STAFF, HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO
16 MAKE A HIGH PRIORITY OUT OF THIS, AND IT'S TAKEN A
17 CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF GRASS ROOTS EFFORT TO GO
18 OUT THERE TO THE GRASS ROOTS TO GET THESE
19 DOCUMENTS AND THESE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES WHERE
20 THEY ARE FOR A NUMBER OF THESE JURISDICTIONS. AND
21 STAFF REALLY PUT A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF WORK INTO
22 IT, AND I REALLY WANT TO COMPLIMENT THEM ON THE
23 EFFORT.

24 AND I CAN'T -- I'VE BEEN INVOLVED IN
25 A LOT OF STATE PLANNING PROCESSES, USUALLY FROM

1 RICHARD'S POINT OF VIEW ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE
2 COUNTER, AND THE LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE WE'RE NOW AT
3 IS PHENOMENAL AND UNPRECEDENTED AT ANY LEVEL. IT
4 HASN'T BEEN PAINLESS. I'M NOT TRYING TO, LIKE,
5 GLOSS OVER THE DIFFICULTIES, BUT I THINK THE CALM
6 PERSISTENCE OF STAFF HAS HELPED US GET TO THIS
7 POINT. SO I WANTED TO -- AT LEAST PUBLICLY CALM.
8 PRIVATELY YOU MAY TEAR YOUR HAIR OUT. I WANTED TO
9 MENTION THAT.

10 MR. DILLON: THANK YOU, SIR.

11 THAT CONCLUDES THE FIRST HALF OF
12 STAFF'S PRESENTATION, AND OUR RECOMMENDATION AT
13 THIS POINT IS TO ACCEPT THE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES
14 OF 120 DAYS OR LESS AND ACCEPT THE COMPLIANCE
15 SCHEDULES OF GREATER THAN 120 DAYS WITH THE
16 EXCEPTIONS NOTED FOR UNION CITY, COLUSA, WILLIAMS,
17 AND COLUSA COUNTY. AND WE WOULD AMEND THE
18 RESOLUTION AT WHATEVER THE DIRECTION OF THE
19 COMMITTEE WOULD BE AT THAT POINT.

20 AND WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO -- AND
21 THEN FORWARD THAT TO THE FULL BOARD FOR ITS
22 CONSIDERATION.

23 WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO TURN IT OVER
24 TO MR. ELLIOT BLOCK NOW. WE ALSO WOULD LIKE TO
25 ACKNOWLEDGE, THANK YOU FOR YOUR KIND WORDS.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 ELLIOT HAS BEEN QUITE HELPFUL IN HIS DILIGENT
2 CONTRIBUTION IN THIS AND SO HAS MR. TREVOR
3 ANDERSON, WHO IS NOW WITH THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD.
4 TREVOR MADE NUMEROUS PHONE CALLS AND WAS VERY
5 PERSISTENT IN GETTING THE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES AND
6 THE DOCUMENTS FILED.

7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WELL, IF YOU COULD SEE
8 TO IT THAT COMMITTEE CHAIR'S COMMENDATION GETS
9 PASSED ALONG TO TREVOR, I'D APPRECIATE IT.

10 MR. BLOCK: BEFORE --

11 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: YOU TOO ELLIOT.

12 MR. BLOCK: BEFORE WE LEAVE THE TOPIC OF
13 THE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES, LET ME JUST ADD A LITTLE
14 BIT AS WELL TO THAT.

15 ATTACHMENT 8, WHICH IS PAGE 141 OF
16 YOUR PACKETS, IT'S THE LAST PAGE OF THE AGENDA
17 ITEM, CONTAINS A FLOW CHART THAT SORT OF GIVES A
18 PICTURE OF WHAT LLOYD HAS BEEN PRESENTING THIS
19 MORNING IN TERMS OF WHERE THE DIFFERENT
20 ATTACHMENTS FIT AND WHAT WE'RE ASKING FOR THE
21 COMMITTEE AND ULTIMATELY THE BOARD TO DO.

22 AND THERE ARE EXTRA COPIES OF THIS
23 ATTACHMENT ON THE BACK PAGE FOR THOSE OF YOU THAT
24 DON'T HAVE AN AGENDA ITEM.

25 I JUST WANTED TO ALSO ADD A LITTLE

1 BIT OF EXPLANATION ON THE RECORD ABOUT WHAT
2 SPECIFICALLY WE'RE ASKING THE BOARD TO DO, AND
3 I'VE USED THE WORD "ACCEPTANCE" IN THIS FLOW CHART
4 AS WELL AS IN THE ITEM IN TERMS OF TALKING ABOUT
5 THE DECISION WE'RE ASKING FOR, ON THE COMPLIANCE
6 SCHEDULES SPECIFICALLY, AS TO DISTINGUISH IT
7 SOMEWHAT FROM THE TERM "APPROVAL."
8 AND THAT IS WHAT WE'RE ASKING THE
9 COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD TO DO IS TO ACCEPT THE
10 COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES THAT HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED FOR
11 THE PURPOSES OF NOT HAVING TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC
12 HEARING AT THIS POINT IN TIME TO CONSIDER
13 ENFORCEMENT ACTION, BUT THAT THE COMMITTEE AND THE
14 BOARD BY THIS ACTION ARE NOT APPROVING OF THE FACT
15 THAT THESE ELEMENTS HAVE COME IN THREE PLUS YEARS
16 LATE. AND SO I THOUGHT THAT WAS IMPORTANT TO BE
17 CLEAR ON THE RECORD. ULTIMATELY THAT MAY NOT BE
18 THE DECISION THE COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD HAVE TO
19 WORRY ABOUT, BUT I THOUGHT THAT WAS AN IMPORTANT
20 DISTINCTION TO GET ON THE RECORD.
21 THE OTHER THING YOU WILL NOTICE
22 ABOUT THE FLOW CHART IS THAT, AND THIS KIND OF
23 SEGUES INTO THE NEXT PART OF THE PRESENTATION AS
24 WELL, IS THAT, AS WE HAVE SET UP AT THIS POINT IN
25 TIME, WITH THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE COMPLIANCE

1 SCHEDULE, STAFF WILL BE MONITORING COMPLETION OF
2 THE SCHEDULES.

3 ASSUMING THOSE SCHEDULES ARE
4 COMPLETED AND AS NOTED AND THE ELEMENTS COME IN
5 AND THEY'RE APPROVED AND EVERYTHING WORKS OUT
6 WELL, TO THE EXTENT THAT A COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE IS
7 NOT MET, AS STAFF HAS SET THE PROCEDURES OUT AT
8 THIS POINT IN TIME FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION, WE
9 WOULD BE GOING DIRECTLY TO A PUBLIC HEARING TO
10 CONSIDER ENFORCEMENT ACTION IF THOSE COMPLIANCE
11 SCHEDULES WERE NOT MET AS OPPOSED TO COMING BACK
12 TO THE COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD TO DECIDE WHETHER
13 OR NOT TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING. AND THAT'S PURELY
14 FOR BASICALLY EFFICIENCY, RESOURCE REASONS, AND
15 THE LIKE TO CUT DOWN ON THE NUMBER OF THE MEETINGS
16 WHERE WE'LL BE DISCUSSING BASICALLY THE SAME
17 TOPIC. I'M POINTING THAT OUT SIMPLY BECAUSE IT'S
18 A LITTLE BIT MORE STREAMLINED THAN THE WAY WE
19 NORMALLY DO THIS.

20 HAVING SAID THAT, THE NEXT QUESTION
21 I HAVE IS WHETHER OR NOT THE COMMITTEE WANTS US TO
22 CONTINUE WITH THE DISCUSSION OF HEARING PROCEDURES
23 AND CRITERIA, OR YOU HAVE THE OPTION, IF YOU WANT
24 NOW, WE COULD CONSIDER JUST THE COMPLIANCE
25 SCHEDULES. AND I'VE SPLIT THEM UP IN TWO

1 RESOLUTIONS, AND YOU COULD MAKE THAT DETERMINATION
2 NOW, OR WE COULD DO THEM BOTH AT THE TAIL END OF
3 THE WHOLE PRESENTATION.

4 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WELL, IT'S IMPORTANT
5 TO NOTE THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS IS BASED
6 ON THAT SORT OF HYPOTHETICAL AND NOT, YOU KNOW,
7 CREATE THE IMPRESSION THAT ALL THESE JURISDICTIONS
8 THAT ARE BEFORE US ARE ABOUT TO BE DRAGGED INTO A
9 PUBLIC HEARING. SO I THINK WE PROBABLY SHOULD GO
10 AHEAD AND ACT ON THE RECOMMENDATION FOR THE
11 JURISDICTIONS AND THE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES, AND
12 THEN TALK ABOUT THE PROCEDURES SO THAT THEY'RE
13 SOMEWHAT DISTINCT AND WE'RE NOT CREATING THE
14 IMPRESSION THAT THEY'RE ALL INTERWOVEN. AT THIS
15 POINT I THINK WE'RE VERY HOPEFUL THAT WE'RE NOT
16 GOING TO HAVE TO HOLD TOO MANY PUBLIC HEARINGS, IF
17 ANY.

18 SO MY INCLINATION ON THE FIRST
19 MOTION WOULD BE TO ACCEPT THE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES
20 FOR THE JURISDICTIONS THAT HAVE FAILED TO SUBMIT
21 PLANS AND FORWARD THEM TO THE FULL BOARD. AND I
22 NEED TO ASK STAFF FOR HOW WE WOULD MODIFY THAT TO
23 PUT COLUSA COUNTY AND THE TWO CITIES ON THE
24 SIMILAR SCHEDULE? WOULD IT -- WHAT WOULD BE THE
25 STEPS TO CHANGE WHAT THEY HAVE SUBMITTED TO BRING

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 THEM UP TO, WHAT WOULD IT BE, SEPTEMBER?

2 MR. DILLON: SEPTEMBER OR THE LATEST

3 DECEMBER. WE'VE WORKED OUT -- ALAN WHITE AND BILL

4 HUSTON OF THE NORTH SECTION STAFF AND I HAVE

5 WORKED OUT A SCHEDULE, WHICH WE'D BE GLAD TO SIT

6 DOWN WITH MR. DICKSON AND GO OVER AND GET THAT

7 DONE. AND I THINK IT COMES UP TO, BILL, DECEMBER

8 OR SEPTEMBER?

9 MR. HUSTON: DECEMBER.

10 MR. DILLON: DECEMBER, BASED ON THE

11 INFORMATION WE HAVE.

12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: NOW THAT --

13 MR. DILLON: WE CAN TIGHTEN IT UP FURTHER

14 THOUGH.

15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THAT FALLS SEVERAL

16 MONTHS LATER THAN ANY OTHER WE WILL HAVE GRANTED?

17 MR. DILLON: YES.

18 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SEPTEMBER IS CURRENTLY

19 WHAT --

20 MR. DILLON: WE CAN DO ONE FOR SEPTEMBER.

21 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'M TRYING TO DECIDE

22 HERE. WHAT IS THE BASIS FOR GOING A COUPLE MONTHS

23 LONGER? WHAT WOULD BE THE BASIS FOR GOING A

24 COUPLE MONTHS LONGER THAN ANY OF THE OTHER

25 JURISDICTIONS?

1 MR. DILLON: ONLY THAT MOST OF THE
2 JURISDICTIONS HAVE FINISHED THEIR PROCESS, AND NOW
3 IT'S REALLY INTO THE ADMINISTRATIVE PORTION OF
4 GETTING IT ON AGENDAS, FINISHING CEQA, AND THE
5 CITY COUNCIL AND PUBLIC HEARINGS. AND IF I
6 UNDERSTAND MR. DICKSON, THEY HAVEN'T FINISHED
7 WRITING THEIR SRRE YET. SO THEIR PROBLEM IS
8 FINISHING WRITING IT AND GETTING IT DONE AND
9 REVIEWING IT. WE CAN TIGHTEN THAT UP AND HAVE IT
10 SUBMITTED THAT WAY.

11 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. WELL, I THINK
12 WE CAN GO WITH DECEMBER FOR THEM. AND SO THAT
13 WOULD, I GUESS, BE INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION.

14 I GUESS THE OTHER QUESTION IS IS
15 THERE ANYTHING, AND THIS IS BOTH FOR STAFF AND FOR
16 MR. DICKSON, IS THERE ANYTHING WE CAN DO AT OUR
17 END TO HELP THEM ACROSS THE FINISH LINE HERE, IF
18 YOU WILL? ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL STAFF
19 ASSISTANCE OR FACILITATION THAT CAN MAKE IT ANY
20 EASIER, OR IS IT SIMPLY A MATTER OF THE DEADLINES
21 AND THRESHOLDS THAT WERE TALKED ABOUT? HAS THERE
22 BEEN ANY DISCUSSION BETWEEN THE STAFF AND THE
23 JURISDICTION ABOUT WHAT --

24 MS. FRIEDMAN: ACTUALLY I BELIEVE LLOYD
25 JUST MENTIONED AS OF YESTERDAY, LLOYD, BILL

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 HUSTON, AND ALAN WHITE OF THE NORTH SECTION SPENT
2 TIME WITH MR. DICKSON WORKING ON THIS SPECIFIC
3 THING, AND OFFERS OF ASSISTANCE WERE DISCUSSED IN
4 THAT PARTICULAR MEETING AS WELL. SO UP UNTIL
5 YESTERDAY, WE'RE STILL WORKING WITH JURISDICTIONS
6 ON SPECIFICS.

7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I WOULD ADD A GENERAL
8 DIRECTION TO STAFF TO WORK CLOSELY WITH THE THREE
9 COLUSA JURISDICTIONS TO GIVE THEM WHATEVER SPECIAL
10 ASSISTANCE IS NEEDED TO HELP THEM MEET THE
11 COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE.

12 SO THE MOTION WOULD BE TO ACCEPT THE
13 COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES TO MODIFY THE CITY OF COLUSA,
14 WILLIAMS, AND COLUSA COUNTY SCHEDULE TO A DECEMBER
15 DATE?

16 MR. DILLON: SURE.

17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: AND ASK STAFF TO DO,
18 YOU KNOW, GIVE SOME SPECIAL EFFORT TO THOSE
19 JURISDICTIONS TO HELP THEM MEET THAT SCHEDULE.

20 MR. DILLON: WHAT ABOUT UNION CITY?

21 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: DO WE HAVE TO DO
22 SOMETHING SPECIAL?

23 MR. DILLON: WE PULLED THAT OUT BECAUSE
24 WE DON'T HAVE -- THEY SUBMITTED SOME INFORMATION.
25 WE HAVE NOT --

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO I WOULD PULL UNION
2 CITY OUT OF THE ACTION, THAT IT WOULD BE
3 CONSIDERED AT THE BOARD MEETING WITHOUT
4 RECOMMENDATION AT THIS POINT. IS THAT YOUR
5 SUGGESTION?

6 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO MOVED.

7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
8 SECONDED, AND WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL
9 CALL, SO THAT MOTION CARRIES.

10 AND NEXT WE WILL GO TO THE
11 ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURE PROCESS.

12 MR. BLOCK: MOVE TO THE PODIUM BECAUSE
13 IT'S JUST A LITTLE EASIER FOR ME TO DO THIS FROM
14 HERE. THERE'S A LOT OF INFORMATION IN THIS AGENDA
15 ITEM. AND BECAUSE, AS WAS MENTIONED BEFORE,
16 HOPEFULLY A LOT OF THIS IS HYPOTHETICAL MORE THAN
17 ANYTHING ELSE. I AM GOING TO TRY AND RUN THROUGH
18 THIS FAIRLY QUICKLY.

19 THERE'S A LOT OF DETAIL, STARTING ON
20 PAGE 66 OF YOUR AGENDA PACKETS, AND THERE'S SORT
21 OF TWO DIFFERENT PARTS OF THIS PRESENTATION. ONE
22 IS THE STRUCTURE OF THE HEARING ITSELF, AND THEN
23 LATER I'LL BE TALKING ABOUT ISSUES OF PENALTY
24 CRITERIA.

25 IN TRYING -- THE STATUTE, OF COURSE,

1 SIMPLY SAYS AFTER PUBLIC HEARING, THE BOARD MAY
2 TAKE SPECIFIED ENFORCEMENT ACTION AND DOESN'T GIVE
3 A LOT OF DETAIL. SO IN TRYING TO DECIDE WHAT THIS
4 PUBLIC HEARING MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT LOOK LIKE, WHAT
5 I HAVE GRAPPLED WITH, WHAT WE HAVE GRAPPLED WITH
6 IS TRYING TO MAKE IT FORMAL ENOUGH SO THAT IT IS
7 ENFORCEABLE AND MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF
8 PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS, BUT ALSO BALANCE THAT WITH
9 SOME REAL PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN TERMS OF HOW
10 FORMAL DOES IT HAVE TO BE.

11 IN A SENSE WE HAVE THE OPTION OF
12 GOING TO AS FORMAL A HEARING BEFORE AN
13 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE, BUT THAT DIDN'T SEEM TO
14 MAKE MUCH SENSE IN THE CONTEXT OF PLAN SUBMITTALS.
15 SO THE PROPOSAL BEFORE YOU HAS WHAT'S, IN ESSENCE,
16 A MODIFIED VERSION OF A BOARD AGENDA ITEM WITH
17 SOME SPECIFIC NOTICE DOCUMENTS AND A SPECIFIC
18 STRUCTURE THAT ARE DESIGNED TO ENSURE THAT WE HAVE
19 A GOOD RECORD AND THAT THERE ARE SOME FORMALITY TO
20 THE PROCEEDING, BUT WITHOUT GOING MUCH FURTHER
21 THAN THAT SO THAT WE CAN DO THESE IN A MANNER THAT
22 MAKES SENSE, I THINK, FOR EVERYBODY. I'LL TALK
23 MORE ABOUT THAT IN JUST A MINUTE.

24 ONE OF THE THINGS YOU WILL NOTICE
25 ABOUT THE PROPOSAL IS THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT

1 HAVING THESE HEARINGS DIRECTLY BEFORE THE BOARD
2 RATHER THAN GOING TO COMMITTEE MEETING FIRST. AND
3 THAT IS PURELY AN ISSUE OF RESOURCES THAT WE'RE
4 LOOKING AT, TRYING TO CUT DOWN ON THE NUMBER OF
5 HEARINGS AND TRAVEL, TRAVEL EXPENSES, PARTICULARLY
6 SINCE THE BOARD DECIDED AT ITS MEETING TWO MONTHS
7 AGO THAT THESE WERE NOT GOING TO BE REGIONAL
8 HEARINGS. WE'RE DEALING WITH SOME SMALLER
9 JURISDICTIONS WHERE HAVING TO COME TO TWO OR THREE
10 MEETINGS MIGHT CREATE SOME ADDITIONAL BURDEN ON
11 THEIR RESOURCES.

12 THE NOTICE DOCUMENTS, WHICH ARE IN
13 ATTACHMENT 7 OF YOUR PACKET, THAT'S STARTING AT
14 PAGE 137 OF YOUR PACKET, CONTAINS A NUMBER OF
15 DOCUMENTS. WE'RE TALKING -- THE PROPOSAL IS THAT
16 THESE DOCUMENTS BE SERVED ON JURISDICTIONS WHEN
17 THEY HAVE NOT MET THEIR COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE, THAT
18 WE WOULD BE SERVING THEM BY CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN
19 RECEIPT REQUESTED, AGAIN NOT PERSONAL SERVICE, BUT
20 WE WANT TO HAVE SOME DOCUMENTATION THAT THE
21 SERVICE HAS OCCURRED.

22 AND WE'RE PROPOSING TO SERVE THOSE
23 ON THE MAYOR OR THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF
24 SUPERVISORS, BASICALLY THE SAME INDIVIDUALS THAT
25 GOT THE LETTERS REGARDING THE COMPLIANCE

1 SCHEDULES, TO MAINTAIN SOME CONSISTENCY. AND THAT
2 WE GIVE THEM AT LEAST 30 DAYS NOTICE PRIOR TO THE
3 HEARING. THIRTY DAYS IS NOT A MAGIC NUMBER. IT
4 SEEMED -- IT'S A NUMBER THAT'S STANDARDLY USED,
5 BUT THE BOARD -- COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD OBVIOUSLY
6 HAS THE OPTION TO MODIFY THAT.

7 I'LL NOTE AS A PRACTICAL MATTER WHAT
8 THAT PROBABLY MEANS IS THAT THE HEARING WILL
9 ALWAYS BE AT THE SECOND BOARD MEETING AFTER
10 FAILURE TO MEET THE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE BECAUSE OF
11 THE TIMING OF BOARD MEETINGS. SO THE 30 DAYS'
12 NOTICE REALLY INVOLVES CLOSER TO TWO MONTHS AS A
13 PRACTICAL MATTER.

14 IN YOUR PACKET ARE SOME GENERIC
15 FORMS IN TERMS OF THAT HEARING. BASICALLY FOUR
16 PIECES OF PAPER. WE'RE TRYING TO NOT OVERDO THE
17 LEVEL OF FORMALITY ON THESE HEARINGS AGAIN. AND
18 THE IDEA THAT WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE'S
19 SOME SUFFICIENT NOTICE AND DOCUMENTATION OF WHAT
20 THE HEARING IS ABOUT, BUT NOT SERVE AN EXHAUSTIVE
21 TYPE OF AN ACCUSATION OR THE LIKE SIMILAR TO
22 WHAT'S DONE IN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW HEARINGS BEFORE
23 THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES.

24 SO YOU'LL SEE THERE'S A DRAFT COVER
25 SHEET BASICALLY GIVING DATE, TIME, AND PLACE

1 INFORMATION, A COPY OF THE SPECIFIC STATUTE THAT
2 THE HEARINGS ARE HELD UNDER, A -- OH, I NOTICED A
3 TYPO -- A SUMMARY OF HEARING PROCEDURE. THAT'S
4 BASICALLY ONE SHEET THAT GOES THROUGH THE
5 STRUCTURE OF HOW THE HEARING WILL BE PRESENTED
6 AND, AGAIN, GIVING THE RECIPIENTS NOTICE OF WHERE
7 THEY FIT INTO THAT HEARING PROCESS. AND THEN ONE
8 SHEET WHICH WILL HOPEFULLY ONLY BE ONE PAGE LONG,
9 GIVING A VERY BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE
10 NONCOMPLIANCE THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT, WHAT
11 ELEMENT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT, WHAT THE DUE DATES
12 WERE; AND THEN TO THE EXTENT THAT WE HAVE SOME
13 INFORMATION ABOUT WHY THAT MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE
14 BEEN SUBMITTED, WE'LL TRY TO INCLUDE THAT
15 INFORMATION.

16 AGAIN, THESE ARE ALL -- THESE ARE
17 ALL DOCUMENTS DESIGNED TO MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE
18 SOME -- MEET SOME BASIC DUE PROCESS STANDARDS IN
19 TERMS OF WHAT THE HEARING IS DOING AND THE LIKE
20 AND STRUCTURE THE HEARING SO THAT WE CAN
21 CONCENTRATE ON THE ISSUES THAT THE BOARD NEEDS TO
22 DECIDE IN TERMS OF WHAT ENFORCEMENT ACTION IS
23 APPROPRIATE AS OPPOSED TO WHAT DOCUMENTS NEED TO
24 BE SUBMITTED OR NOT SUBMITTED, THAT SORT OF THING.

25 THEN ALONG WITH THE HEARING

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 PROCEDURES, I'VE GOT NOTED HERE AGENDA ITEM PAGES
2 9 THROUGH 11, WHICH IN YOUR PACKET IS STARTING ON
3 PAGE 139, IS A PROPOSED STRUCTURE FOR THE HEARING.
4 I'M NOT GOING TO GO THROUGH THAT IN DETAIL, BUT
5 BASICALLY SORT OF LISTS HOW THE PRESENTATIONS ARE
6 MADE, WHO SAYS WHAT WHEN AND THE LIKE.

7 IT'S A FAIRLY INFORMAL PROCEDURE AS
8 HEARING PROCEDURES GO IN THE SENSE THAT, FOR
9 INSTANCE, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT YOU DON'T SEE ON
10 THIS LIST IS CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES AND
11 THE LIKE. AND ONE OF THE REASONS FOR THIS
12 HEARING, WE'VE SET IT UP THIS WAY, IS THE PLAN
13 SUBMITTAL HEARINGS ARE FAIRLY SIMPLE IN TERMS OF
14 FACTUAL ISSUES; IN OTHER WORDS, THERE'S A DOCUMENT
15 NEEDED TO BE SUBMITTED AND WASN'T SUBMITTED. AND
16 REALLY THE FOCUS OF THESE HEARINGS, IF WE HAVE TO
17 HAVE ANY, WILL BE ON THE WHYS AND WHETHER THERE
18 WERE GOOD FAITH EFFORTS AND THOSE SORTS OF ISSUES,
19 AND THOSE ARE NOT REALLY FACTUAL ISSUES IN THE
20 SENSE THAT YOU NEED TO CROSS-EXAMINE INDIVIDUALS
21 OR STRUCTURE IT LIKE A COURT HEARING. OBVIOUSLY
22 THERE'S AMPLE ROOM IN THIS STRUCTURE FOR BOARD
23 MEMBERS TO ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT THOSE TYPES OF
24 ISSUES.

25 AND HAVING SAID THAT, I SHOULD

1 MENTION THAT WE'RE VERY SPECIFICALLY DESIGNING
2 THIS STRUCTURED JUST FOR HEARINGS FOR FAILURE TO
3 SUBMIT ELEMENTS, ADEQUATE ELEMENTS, AND NOT FOR
4 THE HEARINGS THAT MAY -- WE MAY HAVE TO TALK ABOUT
5 IN THE FUTURE REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES.
6 ALTHOUGH A LOT OF THE STRUCTURE MAY CARRY OVER TO
7 THAT, THAT WOULD BE POTENTIALLY A MUCH MORE
8 FACTUAL, INTENSIVE KIND OF A HEARING WHERE THERE
9 WILL BE SOME DISPUTES AS TO NUMBERS AND PROGRAM
10 IMPLEMENTATION AND THOSE KINDS OF ISSUES.

11 AND THAT VERY QUICKLY IS A SUMMARY
12 OF THE PROPOSED HEARING NOTICE STRUCTURE AND THE
13 LIKE THAT WE'VE GOT. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, I
14 COULD ASK THOSE NOW OR I COULD GO RIGHT INTO
15 TALKING ABOUT THE PENALTY CRITERIA.

16 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ANY QUESTIONS? NO.

17 MR. BLOCK: AND MOVING ON TO THE PENALTY
18 CRITERIA, AND THIS IS IN -- THE DISCUSSION IN YOUR
19 AGENDA STARTS ON PAGE 70, WHERE THERE'S I'LL CALL
20 IT DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE CRITERIA, ALTHOUGH
21 IT'S NOT VERY DETAILED. AND THERE'S A LIST OF THE
22 ACTUAL CRITERIA ON PAGE 79 OF YOUR PACKET.

23 WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING IS A LIST
24 OF -- AND CRITERIA IS AN UNFORTUNATE USE OF TERMS,
25 BUT I COULDN'T THINK OF A DIFFERENT WORD TO USE --

1 WE'RE PROPOSING A LIST OF ISSUES THAT STAFF WILL
2 ANALYZE AS WE BRING THESE HEARINGS -- AS THESE
3 HEARINGS COME FORWARD TO THE BOARD FOR CONSIDERA-
4 TION AS OPPOSED TO CRITERIA THAT ACT AS SOME SORT
5 OF A FORMULA THAT IF XYZ ARE TRUE, A FINE SHOULD
6 BE A CERTAIN AMOUNT. AND THAT'S PRIMARILY A
7 FUNCTION OF THE FACT THAT IT IS SO DIFFICULT TO,
8 IN FACT, IN THE ABSTRACT DESIGN ANY SORT OF A
9 DOLLAR AMOUNT TO ANY SORT OF FAILURE THAT WE'RE
10 TALKING ABOUT HERE.

11 AND SO WHAT WE HAVE PROPOSED FOR THE
12 COMMITTEE AND FOR THE BOARD IS THAT A LIST OF
13 FACTORS THAT ARE RELEVANT BASED ON THE STATUTORY
14 PROVISIONS AND THE LIKE AS TO ISSUES OF GOOD FAITH
15 AND/OR WHAT THE FINE AMOUNT SHOULD BE, SHOULD WE
16 HAVE TO HAVE A HEARING ON THAT, TO PROVIDE A
17 STRUCTURE OF BASIC INFORMATION THAT STAFF WILL
18 BRING FORWARD TO THE BOARD FOR CONSIDERING AS IT
19 DECIDES HOW TO MOVE FORWARD.

20 STAFF WOULD ALSO BE RECOMMENDING A
21 PARTICULAR FINE AMOUNT, AND THERE'LL BE SOME
22 EXPLANATION AS HOW THAT WAS ARRIVED AT; BUT IN
23 TERMS OF WHAT'S IN FRONT OF YOU RIGHT NOW, THERE'S
24 NO FINE AMOUNTS INVOLVED THERE. IT'S SIMPLY THESE
25 ARE THE FACTORS THAT WE WILL ANALYZE AS WE BRING

1 THIS MATTER FORWARD IF WE HAVE TO HAVE A HEARING.
2 THERE ARE NINE, BUT THERE'S REALLY
3 EIGHT BECAUSE NO. 9 IS A CATCHALL OF ANY OTHER
4 RELEVANT INFORMATION. AND I'LL JUST RUN THROUGH
5 THEM VERY QUICKLY. LATENESS OF THE ELEMENT, WHICH
6 ELEMENT IS NOT FILED; FOR INSTANCE, IS IT THE SRRE
7 OR IS IT THE NDFE. THAT WOULD BE AN IMPORTANT
8 FACTOR. WHAT'S THE EFFECT OF THE FAILURE TO FILE?
9 AS YOU HEARD EARLIER TODAY FROM COLUSA COUNTY,
10 THEY ARE IMPLEMENTING SOME PROGRAMS, EVEN THOUGH
11 THEIR PLANNING DOCUMENT IS NOT DONE, SO THERE MAY
12 BE SOME ISSUES THERE THAT ARE RELEVANT.
13 THE NATURE OF THE DOCUMENTS THAT
14 WERE SUBMITTED. IN SOME CASES WE'VE GOTTEN NO
15 DOCUMENTATION AND SOME CASES WE HAVE GOTTEN SOME
16 DOCUMENTS, BUT THEY'RE EITHER INADEQUATE FOR SOME
17 REASON OR THEY'RE INCOMPLETE FOR SOME REASON, SO
18 THAT WOULD BE A RELEVANT FACTOR. REASONS FOR THE
19 FAILURE TO FILE IN THE FIRST PLACE.
20 AND THEN NO. 6 IS REASON FOR FAILURE
21 TO MEET COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE BECAUSE, AS WE TALKED
22 ABOUT EARLIER, THESE ARE HEARINGS THAT WILL BE
23 BASED ON NOW, NOT JUST A FAILURE TO FILE THE
24 ELEMENT IN THE FIRST PLACE, BUT A FAILURE TO MEET
25 THE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE. SO DEPENDING ON WHAT

1 HAPPENED BETWEEN NOW AND THEN, THAT MAY BE
2 RELEVANT.

3 EFFECTIVE INADEQUACY ON THE
4 ACHIEVEMENT OF THE DIVERSION REQUIREMENTS.
5 ECONOMIC SITUATION TO THE JURISDICTION AND THE
6 EFFECT OF THE PENALTY ON THE JURISDICTION.

7 THIS -- THERE'S NO MAGIC TO THIS LIST. I THINK WE
8 SAT DOWN AND THOUGHT OF WHAT ARE THE FACTORS WE
9 THINK THAT WE WOULD WANT TO USE IN TRYING TO MAKE
10 A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD AND WHAT WE THOUGHT
11 THE BOARD WOULD WANT TO SEE AS IT TRIED TO DEAL
12 WITH THIS ISSUE. SO WE'RE CERTAINLY AMENABLE TO
13 ANY ADDITIONAL FACTORS OR CRITERIA THAT YOU EITHER
14 THINK ARE RELEVANT OR THE DELETION OF ANY FACTORS
15 IF YOU REALLY BELIEVE THOSE ARE NOT RELEVANT.

16 AND THAT BASICALLY CONCLUDES THAT
17 PART OF THE PRESENTATION. WHAT WE'RE ASKING IS
18 FOR THE COMMITTEE TO APPROVE AND FORWARD ON TO THE
19 BOARD THE PROPOSED HEARING PROCEDURES, NOTICE
20 DOCUMENTS, AND THE PENALTY CRITERIA FOR THEIR
21 APPROVAL.

22 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. ANY QUESTIONS?
23 SEEMS LIKE YOU'VE DONE A VERY THOROUGH JOB.

24 MEMBER FRAZEE: HOPE WE DON'T NEED IT.

25 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THAT'S THE HOPE. AND

1 CERTAINLY WORK STAFF -- THE WORK THAT STAFF'S DONE
2 AND OUR ACTION TODAY INCREASES THAT HOPE THAT WE
3 WON'T NEED IT, BUT REMAINS TO BE SEEN WHETHER
4 EVERYBODY MAKES THE COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES AND
5 EVERYTHING COMES IN AS CLEANLY AS LOOKS LIKE IT'S
6 GOING TO RIGHT NOW. BUT I'M SURE THAT STAFF WILL
7 CONTINUE TO DO THE GREAT JOB THEY ARE TO HELP US
8 GET THERE.

9 SO THE MOTION WE NEED IS TO ACCEPT
10 STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND APPROVE THE PUBLIC
11 HEARING PROCEDURES AND PENALTY CRITERIA LISTED IN
12 OPTION 1 AND FORWARD THAT TO THE BOARD.

13 MEMBER FRAZEE: AND THAT'S CONTAINED IN
14 RESOLUTION 97-147 AND I'LL MOVE THAT.

15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THAT'S WHAT I MEANT.
16 I'LL SECOND IT AND WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL
17 CALL. MOTION CARRIES. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

18 NEXT ITEM IS ITEM 15, CONSIDERATION
19 OF THE AWARD OF THE 1996 CALMAX MATCH OF THE YEAR
20 AND PROGRAM UPDATE.

21 MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, KEVIN
22 TAYLOR AND KEN DECIO WILL BE PRESENTING THIS ITEM.
23 WHAT THEY'RE GOING TO DO IS A TWO-PART ITEM. THE
24 FIRST THING THAT THEY'RE GOING TO DO IS DESCRIBE
25 FOR YOU THE CALMAX MATCH OF THE YEAR, THE PROCESS,

1 AND THE RECIPIENT, AND THEN WHAT THEY'RE GOING TO
2 DO AS WELL IS PROVIDE YOU WITH A PROGRAM UPDATE
3 AROUND SOME CHANGES THAT HAVE OCCURRED TO CALMAX,
4 AND I THINK WE HAVE SOME EXCITING THINGS TO CONVEY
5 TO YOU. WITH THAT, I'LL TURN OVER TO STAFF.

6 MR. TAYLOR: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING,
7 MR. CHESBRO AND MR. FRAZEE. STOLE SOME OF MY
8 THUNDER THERE, SO I'LL JUST GO RIGHT TO IT. KEN
9 DECIO AND I WILL BE PRESENTING THIS ITEM. AGAIN,
10 IT'S A TWO-PART ITEM. FIRST PART, GAINING YOUR
11 APPROVAL FOR THE AWARDING OF THE 1986 CALMAX MATCH
12 OF THE YEAR TO SATICOY RECYCLING, AND THE SECOND
13 PART TO UPDATE THE BOARD ON THE CURRENT STATUS AND
14 FUTURE VISION OF THE CALMAX PROGRAM.

15 THE CALMAX PROGRAM IS CURRENTLY
16 UNDERGOING QUITE A FEW CHANGES TO REDUCE THE
17 PROGRAM COSTS AND STREAMLINE THIS OPERATION. AND
18 STAFF CERTAINLY APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO
19 SPEAK TO YOU TODAY.

20 THE MATCH OF THE CATALOG FEATURED IN
21 EACH ISSUE OF CALMAX HIGHLIGHTS AN EXCHANGE MADE
22 THROUGH THE CALMAX -- MADE THROUGH CALMAX THAT
23 MIGHT INSPIRE READERS TO MORE FULLY UTILIZE THE
24 PROGRAM. EACH YEAR ONE OF THE MATCH-OF-THE-
25 CATALOG STORIES IS CHOSEN AS THE MATCH OF THE YEAR

1 BY AN AD HOC PANEL OF BOARD ADVISORS AND/OR
2 COMMITTEE ANALYSTS, AND EACH BOARD MEMBER WAS
3 REPRESENTED ON THIS PANEL.

4 SELECTION OF THE MATCH OF THE YEAR
5 IS BASED ON CRITERIA DEVELOPED EACH YEAR THAT
6 BALANCES THE AMOUNT OF MATERIAL DIVERTED,
7 PRIORITIES OF THE CALMAX PROGRAM, RELATIVE SAVINGS
8 TO THE BUSINESSES INVOLVED, AND THE NOTEWORTHINESS
9 OF THE EXCHANGE.

10 AFTER A BRIEFING EACH AWARD PANEL
11 MEMBER REVIEWED AND EVALUATED THE MATCH-OF-THE-
12 CATALOG STORIES. THE PANEL'S EVALUATIONS WERE
13 THEN COMPILED TO DETERMINE THE PROPOSED RECIPIENT
14 OF THE 1996 MATCH-OF-THE-YEAR AWARD.

15 JUST TO GIVE YOU A LITTLE BIT ABOUT
16 EACH ONE OF THE CANDIDATES, THERE'S SIX OF THEM,
17 ONE FROM EACH CATALOG IN THE LAST YEAR. THE FIRST
18 WAS RICK HICKS, AND HE WAS A PROPERTY CONTROLLER
19 AND RECYCLING COORDINATOR FOR THE CALIFORNIA
20 DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION. AND HE
21 DEVELOPED AN IN-HOUSE MATERIALS EXCHANGE PROGRAM
22 CALLED CPDR-MAX, AND ALSO THROUGH AN AD IN CALMAX,
23 HE WAS ALSO ABLE TO EXCHANGE OBSOLETE ELECTRONIC
24 EQUIPMENT WITH A COMPUTER RECYCLING COMPANY IN
25 SACRAMENTO.

1 THE SECOND WAS TONIA METZ OF SERVICE
2 DISABLED VETERANS/AMERICA CONSULTING & COMMODITIES
3 INCORPORATED. AND THEY FOUND A HOME FOR 5,000
4 SQUARE FEET OF OFFICE FURNITURE, AND THEY WERE
5 ABLE TO SELL OR DONATE 17,000 TONS OF OFFICE
6 EQUIPMENT AND FURNITURE DONATED TO LOCAL
7 LIBRARIES, NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS, AND SMALL
8 BUSINESSES.

9 THE THIRD WAS PHIL MARTELL. HE WAS
10 A CITY ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE CITY OF WILLIAMS, AND
11 THEY GOT RID OF OVER 40,000 LAW BOOKS THAT WERE
12 COSTING THE CITY OVER \$3,000 A YEAR TO STORE BY
13 PLACING AN AD IN CALMAX. MOST OF THE WHITE LEDGER
14 PAPER WAS ABLE TO BE RECOVERED AND OVER 7,000
15 LEATHERBOUND BOOKS WERE USED FOR DECORATING
16 PURPOSES.

17 THE FOURTH WAS MR. LOU HERNANDEZ,
18 AND HE'S FORMERLY OF LOS ANGELES, AND HE FOUND
19 MOST OF THE MATERIALS HE NEEDED TO CONSTRUCT A NEW
20 HOUSE IN ENSENADA, MEXICO, FROM THE CALMAX
21 CATALOG. WITH THE HELP OF CALMAX, HE ALSO STARTED
22 AN IMPORT/EXPORT BUSINESS CALLED BROKEN BARRIERS
23 BROKERS. THROUGH HIS ONGOING TRANSACTION, LOU HAS
24 SAVED OVER \$7600 AND DIVERTED OVER 21,000 POUNDS
25 OF MATERIALS FROM THE LANDFILL AT THE TIME OF THE

1 STORY.

2 VIC CAPATA WAS THE FIFTH, AND HE WAS
3 WITH THE "PRESS ENTERPRISE," A DAILY NEWSPAPER IN
4 RIVERSIDE, AND HE WAS LOOKING FOR WAYS TO REDUCE
5 THE AMOUNT OF MATERIALS THAT THEY WERE THROWING
6 AWAY. AND AT THE TIME OF THE STORY, THE PRESS
7 ENTERPRISE HAD SAVED SUBSTANTIALLY ON DISPOSAL
8 COSTS, DIVERTING OVER 9,000 POUNDS OF PLASTIC FROM
9 THE LANDFILL AND EARNING NEARLY A THOUSAND DOLLARS
10 FROM MATERIALS THROWN AWAY.

11 THE FINAL, AND CERTAINLY NOT THE
12 LEAST, WAS RITA GONZALES. SHE STARTED HER OWN
13 BROKERING BUSINESS, CALLED SATICOY RECYCLING. AND
14 OVER THE THREE YEARS, AND SHE'S BEEN USING CALMAX,
15 PRETTY MUCH A REGULAR USER AND SUPPORTER, AND JUST
16 IN THE LAST TWO YEARS ALONE SHE ESTIMATES THAT
17 SHE'S RECEIVED MORE THAN 550 TONS OF MATERIAL AND
18 SAVED OVER \$33,000 THROUGH DOZENS OF CALMAX
19 EXCHANGES.

20 THIS YEAR THE PANEL, MADE UP AGAIN
21 OF BOARD ADVISORS AND COMMITTEE ANALYSTS, SELECTED
22 SATICOY RECYCLING OF VENTURA TO BE THE 1996 CALMAX
23 MATCH OF THE YEAR. SOME OF THE REASONS THAT THEY
24 PICKED SATICOY WAS THEIR NUMBER OF ONGOING
25 EXCHANGES AND USING THE PROGRAM, THE USE OF LOCAL

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 PROGRAMS, SUCH AS VC MAX FROM VENTURA COUNTY,
2 ACTIVE USES OF THE CALMAX INTERNET SITE, AND
3 DIVERSION OF TARGETED MATERIALS.

4 NOW, THE OPTIONS THAT WE GIVE YOU
5 TODAY TO VOTE ON WOULD BE, ONE, TO AWARD THE 1996
6 CALMAX MATCH OF THE YEAR TO THE PROPOSED
7 RECIPIENT, SATICOY RECYCLING, BASED ON ESTABLISHED
8 CRITERIA AND EVALUATION BY THE AWARD PANEL OR TO
9 DIRECT STAFF TO MODIFY THE ESTABLISHED EVALUATION
10 CRITERIA, RECONVENE THE PANEL -- AWARD PANEL, AND
11 REEVALUATE THE CANDIDATE EXCHANGES, AND RETURN TO
12 THE BOARD WITH THE RESULTS, OR THE COMMITTEE, I
13 SHOULD SAY.

14 STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE COMMITTEE
15 AWARD THE 1996 CALMAX MATCH OF THE YEAR TO THE
16 PROPOSED RECIPIENT, SATICOY RECYCLING, BASED ON
17 THE ESTABLISHED CRITERIA AND EVALUATION BY THE
18 AWARD PANEL. BEFORE YOU VOTE ON THIS, I KNOW YOU
19 REALLY WANT TO, BUT WE'D JUST LIKE TO GIVE YOU THE
20 SECOND PORTION OF THE PROGRAM, WHICH WILL BE DONE
21 BY KEN DECIO, MY PARTNER IN CALMAX.

22 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: BEFORE WE START THAT,
23 CAN I ASK A QUESTION WITH REGARDS TO MATCH OF THE
24 YEAR. OBVIOUSLY WE'RE NOT HAVING A BELLS AND
25 WHISTLES, AUDIOVISUAL, HIGH PROFILE PRESENTATION

1 OF THIS BUSINESS AT THIS MEETING. WHAT DO WE HAVE
2 PLANNED FOR THE APPROPRIATE TIME AND PLACE TO
3 HIGHLIGHT THE SPECIFICS OF THIS BUSINESS AND GIVE
4 IT SOME PUBLICITY AND HIGH PROFILE IT BEFORE THE
5 BOARD?

6 MR. TAYLOR: WELL, THE ONE THING WE'D
7 LIKE TO DO IS, FIRST OF ALL, FIND OUT THE -- WHEN
8 WE DO VOTE ON THEM AND GIVE THEM THE MATCH-OF-THE-
9 YEAR AWARD, FIND OUT WHAT THEY WANT TO DO ALSO.
10 SOMETIMES THOSE BUSINESSES LIKE TO BE PRESENTED AN
11 ITEM MAYBE IN FRONT OF THEIR CITY COUNCIL OR THE
12 CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

13 WE'LL ALSO TRY TO HAVE SOMETHING
14 DONE, I THINK, THE BOARD MEMBER -- THE NEXT AWAY
15 BOARD MEETING IS ON THE CENTRAL COAST SOMEWHERE IF
16 I'M NOT MISTAKEN. THE NEXT ONE AFTER THIS IS IN
17 SAN BERNARDINO, AND THAT'S QUITE A WAYS FROM
18 VENTURA COUNTY, SO SHE PROBABLY CAN'T MAKE THAT
19 ONE, BUT I THINK THE NEXT ONE OUT OF TOWN AFTER
20 THAT IS CLOSER. PASADENA, LITTLE BIT CLOSER, SO I
21 THINK SHE'LL BE AT THAT.

22 MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHESBRO, WE WERE
23 LOOKING AT THE, I BELIEVE IT'S, PASADENA MEETING
24 AS A POSSIBILITY. WE'RE ALSO LOOKING AT POSSIBLY
25 HOSTING AN EVENT AT THE BUSINESS ITSELF AND BEING

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 ABLE TO DRAW LOCAL MEDIA. WE HOPE TO GENERATE A
2 LOT OF INTEREST IN THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION
3 AROUND THIS AWARD.

4 MR. DECIO: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
5 CHESBRO AND COMMITTEE MEMBER FRAZEE. BUSINESSES
6 CONTINUE TO USE CALMAX TO FIND MARKETS FOR THEIR
7 DISCARDS. IN 1996 WE WERE ABLE TO IDENTIFY OVER
8 1100 SUCCESSFUL EXCHANGES, INVOLVING OVER 103,000
9 TONS OF MATERIAL. AND THAT COMPARES FAVORABLY TO
10 1995 NUMBERS. WE WERE ABLE TO IDENTIFY OVER 600
11 EXCHANGES IN '95 WITH 83,000 TONS OF MATERIAL. SO
12 THERE'S BEEN A MARKED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF
13 EXCHANGES WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO IDENTIFY.

14 IN ADDITION, CALMAX STAFF HAS
15 HANDLED OVER 3500 PHONE CALLS FOR THE PROGRAM IN
16 '96, SO THAT'S AVERAGING ROUGHLY 300 A MONTH. SO
17 WE'VE HAD A LOT OF ACTIVITY, AND WE FEEL LIKE
18 WE'VE HAD A SUCCESSFUL YEAR IN '96. HOWEVER, IN
19 SPITE OF THE SUCCESS, WE REALIZE THAT, IN LIGHT OF
20 THE FUTURE OF BUDGET UNCERTAINTIES, WE HAVE TO
21 FIND WAYS TO REDUCE PROGRAM COSTS. SO TODAY I'D
22 LIKE TO SHARE SOME OF THE CHANGES THAT WE'VE
23 IMPLEMENTED TO REDUCE PROGRAM COSTS AND STREAMLINE
24 THE PROGRAM.

25 SOME OF THE CHANGES ARE FAIRLY

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 SIMPLE LIKE THIS ONE. OUR OLD CATALOG USED TO BE
2 A MULTICOLOR PRINTING. THAT SHOWS UP FAIRLY WELL
3 ON THE MONITOR THERE. AND WHAT WE DID WITH OUR
4 NEW CONTRACTOR IS WE CHANGED IT TO A ONE COLOR ON
5 A COLORED STOCK. THAT SEEMS FAIRLY SIMPLE, BUT
6 JUST THIS ONE CHANGE ALONE SAVES OVER \$500 PER
7 ISSUE EACH TIME THE CATALOG IS PRINTED.

8 ANOTHER CHANGE THAT WE'VE
9 IMPLEMENTED IS NORMALLY IN THE OLD CATALOG
10 VERSION, WE HAVE A THREE-COLUMN FORMAT OF
11 LISTINGS, WHICH TAKES UP A LOT OF SPACE. SO WE
12 REDUCED THE FONT SIZE. TAKE THAT BACK. USUALLY
13 IT'S TWO COLUMNS OF LISTINGS. SO WE REDUCED THE
14 FONT SIZE TO THREE, SO NOW WE CAN FIT A LOT MORE
15 LISTINGS ON THE PAGES, SO WE REDUCED THE NUMBER OF
16 PAGES IN THE CATALOG FROM 72 TO 64. SO AS WE
17 CONTINUE TO GET MORE LISTINGS, THIS IS GOING TO BE
18 IMPORTANT FOR US AS WE CAN FIT MORE OF THEM INTO
19 THE CATALOG WITHOUT INCREASING THE AMOUNT OF
20 PAGES.

21 ANOTHER FAIRLY SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE
22 WE'VE MADE IS WE SELECTED A NEW PRINTER TO PRINT
23 THE CATALOG. WE'VE BEEN REALLY HAPPY WITH THEIR
24 SERVICE, AND THIS SAVES US A THOUSAND DOLLARS EACH
25 ISSUE WHEN IT GOES TO PRINT.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 ANOTHER FAIRLY MAJOR CHANGE WILL BE
2 HAPPENING IN JULY OF '97. CALMAX WILL NO LONGER
3 BE A BIMONTHLY CATALOG. WE'RE GOING TO GO TO
4 QUARTERLY OR SEASONALLY, AND THIS WILL REDUCE THE
5 PRINTING COST AND MAILING COST BETWEEN SIX TO
6 \$8,000 A YEAR. EVEN THOUGH WE'RE GOING TO BE
7 REDUCING THE PUBLICATION FROM BIMONTHLY TO
8 QUARTERLY, WE BELIEVE THAT OUR CUSTOMERS WILL
9 STILL CONTINUE TO BE TAKEN CARE OF BECAUSE NOW,
10 WITH THE ADVENT OF THE CALMAX INTERNET SITE, THEY
11 CAN GET THE INFORMATION IN A MUCH MORE TIMELY
12 MANNER. AND WE'RE TRYING TO ENCOURAGE OUR
13 CUSTOMERS TO MOVE AWAY FROM THE PRINTED CATALOG
14 AND MOVE TOWARDS THE INTERNET SITE.

15 ALSO TO REDUCE PROGRAM COSTS, FUTURE
16 PROGRAM COSTS, OUR NEW CALMAX CONTRACTOR, PHASE
17 III ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT, THEY'VE BEEN
18 TRAINING US TO BASICALLY HANDLE ALL THE DAY-TO-DAY
19 ACTIVITIES WITHIN CALMAX SUCH AS DATA ENTRY,
20 CATALOG LAYOUT TECHNIQUES, THAT TYPE OF THING, SO
21 IN THE FUTURE WE'LL BE ABLE TO MANAGE ALL ASPECTS
22 OF THE CATALOG EXCEPT FOR THE PHYSICAL PRINTING
23 AND MAILING OF THE CATALOG.

24 AT THIS MOMENT I'D LIKE TO PUBLICLY
25 ACKNOWLEDGE OUR NEW CONTRACTOR, PHASE III

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT. BRENDA SMITH IS HERE
2 FROM PHASE III. AND WE FEEL THAT THEY'VE DONE AN
3 EXCELLENT JOB, AND IT'S REALLY BEEN A PLEASURE TO
4 WORK WITH THEM. SO WE JUST WANT TO THANK FOR THE
5 NICE JOB THAT THEY'VE DONE.

6 AND BRENDA AND PHASE III STAFF HAVE
7 BEEN WORKING WITH OUR INFORMATION MANAGEMENT
8 BRANCH FOLKS BECAUSE THEY'RE DEVELOPING A NEW
9 DATABASE FOR CALMAX. WE'RE WORKING WITH AN OLD
10 OUTDATED SYSTEM. AND SO THIS NEW SYSTEM WILL
11 ALLOW US TO ENTER DATA MUCH MORE EFFICIENTLY AND
12 QUICKLY, SO WE'LL SPEND MORE TIME ACTUALLY HELPING
13 OUR CUSTOMERS FACILITATE EXCHANGES INSTEAD OF
14 MANAGING AN OUTDATED DATABASE AND SPENDING TIME IN
15 THE DATA ENTRY MODE.

16 ANOTHER CHANGE WE'VE IMPLEMENTED IS
17 A LATE LISTER MAINTENANCE PROCESS. IN THE PAST
18 WE'VE SENT LETTERS TO OUR LISTERS WHEN THEIR
19 LISTINGS HAVE EXPIRED. AND NOW WHAT WE'RE GOING
20 TO DO IS HAVE OUR LISTERS ACTUALLY PICK WHEN THEIR
21 EXPIRATION DATE IS GOING TO OCCUR. AND THEN OUR
22 NEW DATABASE IS GOING TO GENERATE A CALL LIST, AND
23 THEN WE'LL BE ABLE TO CONTACT THOSE FOLKS WHEN
24 THEIR LISTINGS EXPIRE AND AT THE SAME TIME BE ABLE
25 TO OBTAIN SUCCESSFUL EXCHANGE DATA WHEN RESOURCES

1 ARE AVAILABLE.

2 SO THESE ARE SOME OF THE THINGS THAT

3 WE'VE TRIED TO DO TO REDUCE PROGRAM COSTS, AND AT

4 THE SAME TIME WE'RE LOOKING AT THE REVENUE SIDE TO

5 GENERATE SOME MONEY FOR THE PROGRAM. ONE

6 POSSIBILITY THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO IMPLEMENT, IF

7 POSSIBLE, IS TO ACCEPT ADVERTISEMENT IN THE CALMAX

8 CATALOG. SO WE'RE CURRENTLY LOOKING INTO THAT

9 PROPOSAL, AND HOPEFULLY WE CAN MAKE SOMETHING WORK

10 OUT IN THE NEXT FEW MONTHS AND WE'LL BE SUBMITTING

11 THAT TO YOU THEN.

12 SO AGAIN, ALL THESE MEASURES ARE

13 DESIGNED TO REDUCE PROGRAM COST, BUT WE FEEL AT

14 THE SAME TIME WE'LL STILL BE ABLE TO PROVIDE

15 QUALITY SERVICE TO OUR CUSTOMERS AND A QUALITY

16 PRODUCT.

17 NOW, COUPLE OTHER AREAS I'D LIKE TO

18 MENTION REGARDING 1996 ARE CALMEX AND MINIMAXES.

19 WITH CALMEX THAT'S A COMPONENT OF CALMAX, WHICH IS

20 THE BOARD'S IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION TO THE BORDER

21 WASTEWISER PROGRAM. AND THIS PROGRAM IS SPONSORED

22 BY THE UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

23 AGENCY AND THE CITIES OF SAN DIEGO AND TIJUANA.

24 THE PROGRAM IS BASICALLY DESIGNED TO

25 ADDRESS WASTE ISSUES WITHIN THE BORDER REGION.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 WE'VE BEEN SUPPORTING THE PROGRAM BY SENDING
2 SELECTED LISTINGS TO BUSINESSES IN THOSE AREAS,
3 AND IN THE FUTURE WE'LL CONTINUE TO SUPPORT CALMEX
4 BY SENDING LISTINGS TO BUSINESSES THAT HAVE
5 PARTICIPATED IN THE CALMEX PORTION OF CALMAX.

6 AS FAR AS MINIMAXES, THE CALMAX
7 STAFF, WE HOSTED A LOCAL MATERIALS EXCHANGE ROUND
8 TABLE IN SEPTEMBER OF '96. AND THE PURPOSE OF
9 THIS WORKSHOP WAS TO HELP STAFF BETTER UNDERSTAND
10 THE NEEDS AND CONCERNS OF THE CALIFORNIA REUSE
11 COMMUNITY AND SHAPE THE FUTURE DIRECTION OF THE
12 CALMAX PROGRAM.

13 PARTICIPANTS -- IT WAS REALLY AN
14 EXCELLENT WORKSHOP, HAD GOOD PARTICIPATION, AND WE
15 LOOKED AT A LOT OF DIFFERENT PROGRAMS. AND
16 THEY'RE ALL OVER THE BOARD. SOME PROGRAMS TAKE A
17 HANDS-OFF APPROACH, LIKE VC MAX IN VENTURA COUNTY.
18 WHAT THEY DO IS THEY BASICALLY ACCEPT LISTINGS,
19 BUT THEY REALLY DON'T GET INTO TRACKING SUCCESSFUL
20 EXCHANGES. ON THE OTHER END OF THE SPECTRUM, YOU
21 HAVE A PROGRAM LIKE PROMAX IN SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
22 WHERE YOU LITERALLY HAVE TO GO THROUGH THEM. THEY
23 FACILITATE ALL THE EXCHANGES. AND THEN YOU HAVE
24 SOMETHING IN BETWEEN LIKE L.A. SHARES IN LOS
25 ANGELES OR BUILDING IN SAN FRANCISCO WHERE THEY'RE

1 LIKE -- WHERE THEY BASICALLY WAREHOUSE THE
2 MATERIALS AND DISTRIBUTE THEM TO THE FOLKS THAT
3 COME IN DOING THE SHOPPING.

4 SO WITH ALL THE DIVERSITY IN THE
5 PROGRAMS, ONE THING DID COME OUT THAT EVERYONE
6 SEEMED TO AGREE ON, AND THAT'S THE EMERGENCE OF
7 THE INTERNET. MOST PARTICIPANTS FELT THAT THE
8 INTERNET IS GOING TO PLAY A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE IN
9 SHAPING FUTURE MATERIALS EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.

10 SPEAKING OF THE INTERNET, WE FEEL
11 THAT THIS IS PROBABLY THE MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENT OF
12 CALMAX IN 1996 WAS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CALMAX ON
13 THE WORLDWIDE WEB. THE PROGRAM -- THE CALMAX ON
14 THE WEB HAS BEEN OPERATING SINCE JUNE OF '96, AND
15 WE FEEL IT'S BEEN VERY SUCCESSFUL. WE'VE HAD OVER
16 6,000 SEARCHES ON OUR DATABASE SINCE THE COUNTER
17 WAS INSTALLED IN NOVEMBER. AND IT'S HELPING US
18 REDUCE MAILING COST AND SAVE PAPER, AND THE
19 INTERNET REALLY OFFERS A LOT OF ADVANTAGES OVER
20 THE PRINTED CATALOG.

21 FIRST, LISTINGS ARE ACCESSIBLE 24
22 HOURS A DAY. SECONDLY, THE INFORMATION IS MUCH
23 MORE CURRENT THAN THE PRINTED CATALOG. THE
24 LISTINGS GET UPDATED AT LEAST WEEKLY; WHEREAS, IN
25 THE PRINTED CATALOG, YOU MIGHT HAVE TO WAIT TWO

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 MONTHS UNTIL YOUR LISTING APPEARS FOR THE NEXT
2 CYCLE OF THE CATALOG TO BE PRINTED.

3 AND THIRDLY, CUSTOMERS CAN POST
4 LISTINGS ELECTRONICALLY FROM THEIR COMPUTER, SO IT
5 SAVES THEM FROM HAVING TO CONTACT US IN
6 SACRAMENTO. SO WE'RE VERY PROUD OF THIS SITE, AND
7 WE THINK THE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT BRANCH HAS
8 DONE AN EXCELLENT JOB IN HELPING US DEVELOP THIS
9 SITE. AND WE'D LIKE TO GIVE YOU A BRIEF, VERY
10 BRIEF, TOUR OF THE SITE. AND KEVIN WILL NARRATE
11 THIS.

12 MR. TAYLOR: THANK YOU. KEN WILL PUT IT
13 UP ON THE SCREEN HERE. WE JUST WANTED TO GIVE YOU
14 A LITTLE FEEL FOR WHAT THE PROGRAM IS LIKE AND HOW
15 FLEXIBLE IT IS. AGAIN, AS KEN MENTIONED, THERE'S
16 MANY ADVANTAGES TO THIS PROGRAM. AND ONE OF THE
17 MAIN THINGS IS EVERYTHING IS AVAILABLE THERE
18 THAT'S IN THE CATALOG, AND WE DON'T HAVE TO SPEND
19 THE MONEY TO PRINT A CATALOG AND SEND IT OUT,
20 WHICH IS OUR MAJOR COST OF THE PROGRAM.

21 KEN IS GOING TO SHOW YOU A LITTLE
22 BIT WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE. AND THIS IS, FOR EXAMPLE,
23 IF YOU WERE LOOKING FOR SOMETHING, YOU HAD
24 SOMETHING FOR, LET'S SAY, MR. FRAZEE WANTED TO
25 TEAR DOWN HIS OLD HOUSE DOWN IN SOUTHERN

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO AREA, AND WANTED TO BUILD A
2 NEW ONE, WHICH I DON'T KNOW IF HE'S DOING, BUT IF
3 THAT'S HE WANTED TO DO, HE COULD TAKE A LOOK IN
4 CALMAX AND JUST GO TO THE MATERIAL TYPES. AND
5 IT'S JUST A POP-UP MENU RIGHT THERE. YOU JUST
6 PICK. VERY EASY.

7 LET'S SAY YOU WANT TO LOOK FOR
8 MATERIALS AVAILABLE AND WANTED SINCE HE IS TEARING
9 IT DOWN AND BUILDING A NEW ONE. AND HE CAN JUST
10 LOOK IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION. WE HAVE 16
11 DIFFERENT REGIONS WITHIN CALIFORNIA. AND HE JUST
12 PICKS THAT REGION, AND HE JUST GOES DOWN A LITTLE
13 BIT FURTHER THERE AND PRESSES THE BUTTON AND UP
14 THEORETICALLY WILL COME ALL THE DIFFERENT LISTINGS
15 IN THAT AREA OF AVAILABLE AND WANTED MATERIALS IN
16 THE CONSTRUCTION. HE CAN JUST GO RIGHT THROUGH
17 THERE.

18 FOR EXAMPLE, IN THAT SECOND LISTING
19 WHERE IT'S BLUE THERE, THAT IS THE E-MAIL SITE FOR
20 THAT PERSON. HE CAN JUST E-MAIL THEM RIGHT FROM
21 THERE, JUST CLICK IT, AND -- MAYBE NOT TODAY. THE
22 GREMLINS THERE -- HE SHOULD BE ABLE TO JUST CLICK
23 AND IT WOULD GO INTO AN E-MAIL, AND YOU JUST SEND
24 AN E-MAIL TO THAT PERSON WHERE YOU HAVE OR HOW
25 MUCH OR WHATEVER IT MAY BE. SO YOU CAN SEE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 THERE'S LOTS OF DIFFERENT MATERIALS AVAILABLE, ALL
2 THE INFORMATION YOU NEED. AND YOU JUST KEEP DOING
3 AS MANY SEARCHES AS YOU WOULD LIKE.

4 ALSO, IF YOU DIDN'T FIND WHAT YOU
5 WANT AND YOU WANTED TO DO YOUR OWN LISTING, YOU
6 COULD DO IT RIGHT FROM HERE ALSO. YOU JUST PLACE
7 A LISTING, AND UP POPS ANOTHER PAGE THAT YOU CAN
8 GO RIGHT INTO. IT GIVES YOU SOME INFORMATION HOW
9 TO DO THAT. YOU PUT YOUR NAME AND ALL THE
10 INFORMATION YOU HAVE. AGAIN, THERE ARE A FEW
11 POP-UP MENUS THERE TO MAKE IT A LITTLE BIT EASIER.
12 YOU PUT ALL THE INFORMATION IN THERE AND IT READS
13 IT BACK TO YOU AFTER YOU DO THAT. AND YOUR
14 LISTING WILL BE PUT UP THERE IN THE NEXT DAY OR
15 SO. YOU CAN SEE ALL THE DIFFERENT AREAS OF
16 CALIFORNIA.

17 AND THE LAST THING YOU CAN DO IF YOU
18 REALLY WANTED TO LOOK AROUND OR YOU WANTED TO PUT
19 ANOTHER LISTING IS WE HAVE LINKS TO MANY OTHER
20 EXCHANGES WITHIN CALIFORNIA AND OUTSIDE OF
21 CALIFORNIA, THE PROGRAMS THAT KEN HAD MENTIONED
22 BEFORE. THERE'S A PROGRAM IN SONOMA COUNTY,
23 SONOMAX, PROMAX, VC MAX THOSE PROGRAMS ARE ALL
24 LOCAL PROGRAMS WITHIN CALIFORNIA. WE ALSO HAVE
25 LINKS TO PROGRAMS OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA AND

1 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES, AS WELL AS OTHER TYPES
2 OF RECYCLING AND REUSE PROGRAMS THAT ALSO HAVE
3 INTERNET SITES.

4 SO YOU CAN SEE HOW THE NETWORK IS
5 FORMING THROUGH ALL THESE REUSE PROGRAMS. THIS IS
6 A GREAT MEDIA. WE FEEL IT'S JUST AN INCREDIBLE
7 BENEFIT TO OUR PROGRAM. WE JUST ARE REALLY HAPPY.
8 THERE'S THAT MANY MORE PEOPLE WHO CAN BE EXPOSED
9 TO OUR PROGRAM OUTSIDE OF JUST A PAPER VERSION, SO
10 WE JUST WANTED TO SHOW YOU THAT.

11 AND I KNOW LOT OF OTHER PROGRAMS ARE
12 DOING THESE TYPES OF THINGS. IT'S SOMETHING THAT
13 WE SUPPORT WHOLLY, AND I THINK IT'S THE FUTURE OF
14 OUR PROGRAM. SO IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE
15 FEEL FREE. AND AFTER THOSE, WE CAN GET BACK TO
16 THE MATCH OF THE YEAR.

17 MS. TRGOVCICH: IF I CAN JUST INTERRUPT
18 FOR A MINUTE. I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY, I KIND OF
19 WENT THROUGH, AND I'VE BEEN TRYING TO GO ON OUR
20 INTERNET SITE RECENTLY BECAUSE IT'S KIND OF AN
21 EVERYDAY OCCURRENCE WHERE ALL OF A SUDDEN AN
22 E-MAIL COMES OUT ACROSS THE ORGANIZATION SAYING
23 SOMETHING NEW IS UP ON OUR WEB SITE.

24 SO IT'S SO EASY TO ACCESS THE CALMAX
25 CLASSIFIED BY GOING INTO THE BOARD'S HOME PAGE AND

1 JUST GO SCROLLING DOWN. YOU CAN GET INTO WASTE
2 PREVENTION WORLD. YOU CAN DO A WHOLE VARIETY OF
3 THINGS. AND IT'S SUCH AN EASY SITE TO ACCESS.
4 AND WE'RE HEARING SO MANY GOOD THINGS ABOUT IT.
5 AND I JUST WANTED TO SAY IF YOU HAVEN'T HAD AN
6 OPPORTUNITY, YOU JUST PULL IT UP AND GO TO THE
7 HOME PAGE AND, YOU KNOW, KIND OF JUST SPEND A FEW
8 MINUTES STROLLING AROUND THROUGH THAT. THERE'S AN
9 AWFUL LOT OF EXCELLENT INFORMATION THERE.

10 MR. TAYLOR: YES. FEEL FREE TO MAKE SOME
11 QUERIES AS TO THE NUMBERS WE HAVE THERE.

12 ONE OTHER THING, INFORMALLY WE HEARD
13 THROUGH THE IMB THAT APPROXIMATELY 40 PERCENT OF
14 THE TRAFFIC THAT GOES THROUGH THE BOARD'S HOME
15 PAGE IS TO CALMAX, SO WE KNOW THAT WE'RE GETTING A
16 LOT OF PEOPLE LOOKING AT IT.

17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WELL, IT'S VERY
18 EXCITING. AND I REMEMBER WHEN WE HAD THIS SORT OF
19 THRESHOLD DISCUSSION ABOUT WHAT THE FUTURE OF
20 CALMAX WAS GOING TO BE, AND THERE WAS A DECISION
21 TO BEGIN TO DE- -- I WANT TO PICK MY WORDS
22 CAREFULLY. I DON'T KNOW IF DE-EMPHASIZE IS THE
23 RIGHT WORD -- BUT MOVE AWAY FROM EXCLUSIVELY
24 DEPENDING ON THE HARD COPY AND TRY TO BUILD THIS
25 UP. AND IT'S REALLY GREAT TO SEE IT COME TO

1 FRUITION AND BE DONE WITH SUCH OBVIOUS CARE AND
2 CREATIVITY. AND I THINK IT'S GONE RIGHT WHERE WE
3 HAD HOPED IT WOULD GO.

4 THE ONLY QUESTION I HAVE IS HOW
5 WE -- AS WE CONTINUE TO DEVELOP IT AND TRANSITION
6 FROM WHAT IT WAS TO AN ON-LINE SERVICE THAT HAS
7 THE CATALOG AS A LESS CRITICAL ADJUNCT, IF YOU
8 WILL, OR ENTRY POINT INTO THE SYSTEM, WHAT METHODS
9 OF MONITORING THE EFFECTS OF EACH CHANGE MIGHT BE
10 IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER OF EXCHANGES, THE NUMBER OF
11 VISITS, THE NUMBER OF CONTACTS, THE AMOUNT OF
12 TONNAGE? WHAT ARE THE MEANS OF THE MEASURING THE
13 EFFECTIVENESS OF THE DIFFERENT THINGS THAT WE'VE
14 BEEN DOING?

15 AND I DON'T MEAN THAT TO BE CRITICAL
16 BECAUSE I THINK IT'S VERY EXCITING, BUT I DO THINK
17 WE NEED TO KEEP TRACK OF IS IT WORKING IN THE WAY
18 WE HAD HOPED IT WOULD.

19 MR. TAYLOR: ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE
20 TRY TO DO IS KEEP TRACK OF ALL -- AS MANY OF THE
21 INTERNET USERS AS WE CAN. FOR EXAMPLE, WE
22 ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO TELL US IF THEY HAVE INTERNET
23 ACCESS. OR AS WE CALL PEOPLE OR AS PEOPLE REQUEST
24 THE CATALOG, WE ASK THEM, AND WE KEEP THOSE NAMES
25 AND ADDRESSES WITHIN OUR DATABASE, SO WE'RE NOT

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 LOSING THOSE PEOPLE. SO IF WE DO DO SURVEYS ON
2 OCCASION, WE CAN GO BACK TO THESE PEOPLE AND ASK
3 THEM IF IT'S WORKING FOR YOU.

4 AND NOW WITH REGARDS TO TRACKING
5 EXCHANGES, WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT'S ALWAYS BEEN
6 VERY DIFFICULT, AND WHAT WE'VE DONE IN THE LAST
7 COUPLE OF YEARS IS WE BASICALLY GO THROUGH THE
8 LISTINGS. WE HAVE ALL THE INFORMATION ON THE
9 PEOPLE WHO ARE LISTERS, THEIR NAMES AND ADDRESSES
10 AND EVERYTHING. SO WE CAN CONTACT THEM. AND
11 THAT'S WHAT WE'VE BEEN DOING THE LAST COUPLE YEARS
12 IS JUST CONTACTING THEM DIRECTLY AS WE NEED TO,
13 JUST SPENDING SOME, YOU KNOW, FOCUSED TIME ON
14 THEM.

15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'M BUILDING MY HOUSE
16 IN ARCATA, AND I FIND BOB'S USED BUILDING
17 MATERIALS AND HIS E-MAIL ADDRESS, AND I SEND HIM
18 AN E-MAIL, AND THE MATERIAL IS SO VALUABLE THAT
19 IT'S WORTH ME SHIPPING IT FROM SAN DIEGO COUNTY TO
20 HUMBOLDT COUNTY, AND I -- YOU WOULD FIND OUT BY
21 SOME POINT SURVEYING AND CONTACTING HIM AS A
22 LISTER AND HIM TELLING YOU, OH, YEAH, I MANAGED TO
23 DIVERT SO MANY TONS OF MATERIAL OUT AS A RESULT OF
24 LISTING. WOULD THAT BE THE --

25 MR. TAYLOR: WELL, BECAUSE WE ARE NOT

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 REAL HANDS-ON, LIKE KEN WAS MENTIONING, WE DON'T
2 FACILITATE EVERY MATCH, IT'S HARD TO GET EVERY
3 ONE. WE DO ENCOURAGE ALL OUR USERS TO TELL US.
4 OF COURSE, MANY OF THEM DON'T. THEY FORGET. SO
5 WE DO FIND THAT SOMETIMES WE JUST HAVE TO GO DOWN
6 AND CONTACT OUR LISTERS AS MUCH AS WE CAN AND TAKE
7 THE TIME TO DO. THAT'S REALLY WHERE WE GET THE
8 BEST NUMBERS. THAT'S ONE OF THE MOST DIFFICULT
9 PARTS OF THE PROGRAM IS REALLY GETTING THOSE GOOD
10 HARD NUMBERS. WE KNOW THAT THERE'S WAY MORE THAN
11 WE EVER KNOW ABOUT.

12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WELL, THERE'S ALWAYS
13 THE TRADE-OFF BETWEEN THE AMOUNT OF TIME YOU WANT
14 TO SPEND GATHERING BITS OF INFORMATION AND THE
15 TIME YOU SPEND MAKING THE PROGRAM WORK. BUT AS A
16 GENERAL MATTER, BE NICE TO HAVE INDICATORS AND
17 CONTINUE TO MONITOR INDICATORS WITHOUT SPENDING
18 HUGE ENERGY TO GET THAT DATA.

19 MR. TAYLOR: IT WAS INTERESTING. THE
20 FIRST FEW YEARS THE PROGRAM HAD ABOUT 120 TO 150
21 EXCHANGES A YEAR. AND THEN THE LAST YEAR WE
22 DECIDED, WELL, LET'S JUST CALL AS MANY LISTERS AS
23 WE CAN. WE'VE GOT ABOUT 550, WHICH IS MORE THAN
24 THREE YEARS COMBINED. AND THIS YEAR WE STARTED TO
25 REALLY, YOU KNOW, PUT AN EFFORT, AND WE HAD ABOUT

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 1100 AND WE DIDN'T EVEN CONTACT EVERYBODY. SO WE
2 KNOW THAT IT'S HAPPENING. IT'S JUST THAT WE CAN'T
3 CONTACT EVERY PERSON.

4 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. EXCELLENT. ANY
5 QUESTIONS? GOOD WORK.

6 MR. TAYLOR: ONE MORE THING THOUGH.

7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OH, YEAH. THAT'S THE
8 ACTION. I ASSUME THAT'S WHAT YOU WERE GOING TO
9 REFER TO. DON'T WORRY. I KNEW.

10 THE MOTION WE NEED IS TO ACCEPT THE
11 COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE -- NO -- ACCEPT STAFF
12 RECOMMENDATIONS AND AWARD THE 1996 CALMAX MATCH OF
13 YEAR TO SATICOY RECYCLING AND FORWARD THAT TO THE
14 BOARD'S CONSENT CALENDAR FOR A MORE FORMAL
15 PRESENTATION AT SOME LATER DATE.

16 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO MOVED.

17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO MOVED. WE'LL
18 SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL CALL. MOTION PASSES.
19 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

20 MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, I WAS
21 WONDERING IF YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO CONSIDER
22 TAKING THE NEXT TWO ITEMS AND FLIPPING THEM. THE
23 WRAP UPDATE WILL PROBABLY BE APPROXIMATELY A
24 FIVE-MINUTE PRESENTATION. AND BECAUSE THE RPPC
25 METHODOLOGY ITEM IS MORE LENGTHY AND MORE COMPLEX,

1 IT WILL TAKE A SIGNIFICANTLY GREATER AMOUNT OF
2 TIME.

3 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THAT WILL BE FINE, BUT
4 ONLY AFTER A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK.

5 (RECESS TAKEN.)

6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WE'RE BACK IN SESSION
7 HERE. AND WE'RE GOING TO JUMP TO ITEM 17, WHICH
8 IS THE UPDATE ON THE 1997 WASTE REDUCTION AWARDS
9 PROGRAM.

10 MS. TRGOVCICH: IN FEAR OF STEALING
11 ANYONE'S THUNDER, I'M JUST GOING TO RUN IT OVER TO
12 LINDA AND JEFF.

13 MS. HENNESSY: GOOD MORNING, COMMITTEE
14 CHAIRMAN AND MEMBER. I'M LINDA HENNESSY, AND I'M
15 HERE TO PRESENT ITEM 17, THE UPDATE ON THE 1997
16 WASTE REDUCTION AWARDS PROGRAM OR WRAP.

17 I'LL START OUT WITH A LITTLE RECAP
18 OF 1996. IN 1996 WE HAD 350 WINNERS. THAT WAS
19 THE FOURTH YEAR OF THE PROGRAM. IN 1996 WE HAD
20 145 TWO-YEAR WINNERS. THOSE ARE COMPANIES THAT
21 HAD APPLIED AND WON TWO YEARS. WE HAD 52
22 THREE-YEAR WINNERS AND 25 FOUR-YEAR WINNERS.

23 IN 1996 WE ALSO INITIATED THE WRAP-
24 OF-THE-YEAR PORTION OF THE PROGRAM WHEREBY TEN OF
25 THE MOST OUTSTANDING COMPANIES WITH WASTE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 REDUCTION PROGRAMS WERE RECOGNIZED. AS A RESULT
2 OF THAT WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR PORTION OF THE PROGRAM,
3 OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND OUR CONTRACTOR WORKED
4 VERY HARD GETTING SOME PRESS MATERIALS OUT THERE.
5 AND THERE WERE A LOT MORE ARTICLES IN 1996 THAN
6 THERE WERE IN '95 ABOUT WRAP OF THE YEAR AND THE
7 REGULAR WRAP WINNERS.

8 FOR 1997 WE HAVE AGAIN INITIATED
9 SOME CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION THAT'S GONE ON
10 EVERY YEAR SINCE THE PROGRAM'S INCEPTION IN 1993.
11 AND THE REASON FOR REVISING THE APPLICATION EVERY
12 YEAR IS TO MAKE IT EVEN MORE USER FRIENDLY TO THE
13 APPLICANTS AND FOR US TO GET AT THE INFORMATION
14 THAT WE REALLY NEED TO, NO. 1, SCORE THE
15 APPLICATIONS EFFECTIVELY AND TO GATHER INFORMATION
16 ABOUT THESE COMPANIES SO WE CAN, IN TURN, PUT IT
17 OUT TO OTHER FOLKS OUT THERE THAT ARE INTERESTED
18 IN BUSINESS WASTE PREVENTION AND RECYCLING.

19 SO WE -- SOME OF THE REVISIONS TO
20 THE APPLICATION THIS YEAR WERE EXPANDED DIRECTIONS
21 FOR THE DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF APPLICANTS. AND
22 BY THAT I MEAN THERE ARE DIFFERENT WAYS THAT
23 BUSINESSES CAN APPLY. AN INDIVIDUAL BUSINESS OR
24 AN INDIVIDUAL FACILITY CAN APPLY; AND IF THEY WIN,
25 THE APPLICANT WILL RECEIVE AN AWARD CERTIFICATE

1 FOR THAT SITE.

2 A LARGER COMPANY WITH MULTIPLE SITES
3 MAY WANT TO APPLY FOR ALL OF THEIR SITES, BUT ONLY
4 AS, LIKE, A CORPORATE-TYPE SITUATION. IN THAT
5 CASE, A COMPANY APPLYING FOR MULTIPLE SITES WITH
6 SIMILAR WASTE REDUCTION PRACTICES BEING
7 IMPLEMENTED AT ALL SITES, IF THEY WERE SCORED HIGH
8 ENOUGH TO BE A WINNER, ONE AWARD CERTIFICATE WOULD
9 GO TO THAT APPLICANT.

10 THE THIRD WAY COMPANIES CAN APPLY IS
11 THE WAY TARGET HAS APPLIED IN THE PAST. AND THEY
12 SUBMITTED APPLICATION FOR MULTIPLE SITES WITH
13 INFORMATION ABOUT EACH SITE. AND IF DETERMINED TO
14 BE A WINNER, EACH SITE GETS THE AWARD CERTIFICATE.
15 SO THAT WAS -- THE CHANGE THAT WAS MADE THIS YEAR
16 ON THE APPLICATION WAS JUST EXPLAINING THOSE THREE
17 DIFFERENT SCENARIOS WHEREBY BUSINESSES COULD
18 APPLY.

19 THIS YEAR WE WILL ALSO MENTION
20 ISO-14000 IN THE APPLICATION SINCE A LOT OF
21 ESPECIALLY SOME OF THE LARGER COMPANIES ARE
22 BECOMING INVOLVED IN THAT. WE WANT TO KNOW WHO IS
23 AND TO WHAT EXTENT.

24 WE HAVE CURRENTLY A CATEGORIZATION
25 OF THE BUSINESS TYPES IN WRAP OF 60 DIFFERENT

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CATEGORIES. WE WILL BE ALSO -- WE WILL BE
2 CHANGING THAT TO THE 38 SUBPOPULATIONS THAT THE
3 BOARD IS USING IN THEIR UNIFORM WASTE
4 CHARACTERIZATION DATABASE, SO WE DON'T HAVE TO
5 COMPARE APPLES AND ORANGES.

6 THIS YEAR WILL BE THE FIFTH YEAR OF
7 THE PROGRAM, SO WE ANTICIPATE FIVE-YEAR WINNERS.
8 AND WE WILL BE GIVING SOME SPECIAL RECOGNITION TO
9 THOSE FOLKS.

10 AND WE IN OUR SCORING METHODOLOGY
11 WILL BE DEVELOPING THE SCORING TO ADDRESS A FEW
12 INEQUITIES THAT HAVE SEEMED TO DISCRIMINATE
13 AGAINST REAL SMALL BUSINESSES, AND THAT'S JUST A
14 SCORING MECHANISM.

15 IN 1997 WE ALSO GREATLY EXPANDED
16 THE -- OUR WEB SITE ON WRAP. BEFORE WE HAD WEB
17 PAGES EXPLAINING WRAP, WHAT WRAP WAS, AND A
18 QUESTION AND ANSWER PAGE. WE NOW HAVE TAKEN THE
19 WHOLE DATABASE OF WRAP 1993 WINNERS THROUGH 1996
20 AND PUT THEM ON A SEARCHABLE DATABASE ON THE WEB.
21 AND JEFF IS GOING TO GIVE YOU A LITTLE DEMONSTRATION OF THIS HERE.

22 WHEN YOU GO INTO THE BOARD'S WEB
23 PAGE IN THE BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY CATEGORY AND
24 THEN SELECT WRAP, YOU CAN GET INTO THE SEARCHABLE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 DATABASE. IT LISTS ALL THE WINNERS BY YEAR WITHIN
2 THE YEAR BY INDUSTRY TYPE, STILL USING THE OLD
3 CATEGORIES, NOT THE 38 NEW CATEGORIES THAT WE'LL
4 BE CHANGING TO AND BY COUNTY.

5 OR YOU CAN LOOK AT THEM ALL
6 STATEWIDE. IF YOU WANT TO LOOK AT ALL THE 1996
7 WINNERS, SAY, STATEWIDE, YOU WILL GET A LIST OF
8 ALL THE WINNERS IN STATE. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO
9 SEARCH BY COUNTY, YOU WILL GET SOME MORE DETAILED
10 INFORMATION, THAT BEING A LITTLE PROFILE ON EACH
11 ONE OF THE COMPANIES THAT PROVIDED A PROFILE AND
12 TELLING YOU ABOUT WHAT THE COMPANY IS, WHAT THEY
13 DO, AND SOMETHING ABOUT THEIR WASTE REDUCTION
14 PRACTICES.

15 SO, JEFF, WHAT ARE YOU SELECTING
16 HERE?

17 MR. HUNTS: WELL, IN MEMORY OF JANET
18 GOTCH, WE WERE LOOKING AT NAPA COUNTY, FOR
19 INSTANCE, FOR 1996 SHOWS BV VINEYARD WAS ONE OF
20 THE WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR WINNERS. DOMAIN SHANDONE, A
21 RETAIL ESTABLISHMENT IN CALISTOGA.

22 MS. HENNESSY: YOU COULD ALSO GO TO --
23 YOU COULD SEARCH BY AN INDUSTRY TYPE. IF YOU
24 WANTED TO KNOW ALL THE HEALTH SERVICES IN A
25 PARTICULAR COUNTY OR THROUGHOUT THE STATE, THE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 WHOLE STATE, YOU COULD SEARCH ON THAT.

2 1993 IS THE ONLY YEAR THAT WE -- THE
3 WRAP PROGRAM DID NOT REQUEST, SO WE DO NOT HAVE
4 THE INDIVIDUAL PARAGRAPH PROFILES FOR EACH OF THE
5 DIFFERENT COMPANIES.

6 THIS YEAR, ONE THING I FORGOT TO
7 MENTION, THE APPLICATION -- 1997 APPLICATION WILL
8 BE ON OUR WEB SITE. WE'LL BE GETTING THAT THERE
9 SOON. IT'S ALMOST FINALIZED, THE APPLICATION IS.
10 IT WAS ON THERE LAST YEAR. AND IF ANYONE WANTS TO
11 SEE WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE, THEY CAN JUST GO TO THE
12 WRAP WEB SITE AND LOOK. IT LOOKS VERY PRETTY.

13 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO THEN CAN APPLY
14 COMPLETELY ELECTRONICALLY.

15 MS. HENNESSY: NOT INTERACTIVELY. AND
16 THE REASON FOR THAT IS -- EXACTLY WHAT IS THE
17 REASON FOR THAT, JEFF?

18 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I'M SORRY I ASKED THE
19 WRONG QUESTION.

20 MS. HENNESSY: THAT'S OKAY. WE
21 ANTICIPATED IT.

22 MR. HUNTS: WE'RE AT A SITUATION WITH THE
23 APPLICATION WHERE BROWSERS CAN BOTH READ IT AS A
24 WEB PAGE AND DOWNLOAD IT AS A PDF FILE, A PORTABLE
25 DOCUMENT FORMAT FILE, FILL IT OUT, AND SEND IT IN.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 WE WOULD LIKE TO IN THE FUTURE, AND THIS IS
2 CERTAINLY A VISION, HAVE POTENTIAL APPLICANTS
3 APPLY COMPLETELY THROUGH THE INTERNET. I THINK
4 BOTH THE OUTSIDE WORLD, AS WELL AS INTERNAL TO THE
5 BOARD, IS STILL COMING UP TO SPEED ON THE ABILITY
6 TO USE FORMS VIA THE INTERNET. AND THE WRAP
7 APPLICATION IS PRETTY COMPLEX. WE WOULD HATE FOR
8 PEOPLE TO SPEND A COUPLE HOURS FILLING IT OUT AND
9 THEN SOMETHING GO WRONG. AND WE'RE NOT CONFIDENT
10 THAT SOMETHING WOULDN'T GO WRONG AT THIS POINT.
11 THAT'S CERTAINLY A VISION FOR THE FUTURE.

12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THAT'S WHAT THE SAVE
13 BUTTON IS FOR.

14 MS. HENNESSY: WELL, I'M SLOWLY BUT
15 SURELY COMING UP TO SPEED ON ALL THIS HIGH TECH
16 STUFF. I WANT TO THANK IMB FOR GIVING US A LOT OF
17 ASSISTANCE WITH INCORPORATING THE WHOLE WRAP
18 DATABASE FOR ALL YEARS, BRINGING IT IN-HOUSE. WE
19 HAVEN'T HAD IT UNTIL THIS YEAR. AND ALSO PUBLIC
20 AFFAIRS FOR THE GOOD WORK THAT THEY DID ON GETTING
21 A LOT OF RECOGNITION IN THE MEDIA FOR THE WINNERS.

22 MR. HUNTS: ONE THING THAT I KNOW THIS
23 COMMITTEE HAS ASKED ABOUT IN THE PAST AND WE'RE
24 CONSTANTLY TRYING TO PUSH ON IS FOR WINNERS TO USE
25 THE WRAP LOGO IN THEIR PRODUCTS OR IN THEIR

1 SERVICES. ONE STAFF PERSON THIS MORNING,
2 UNFORTUNATELY WE DIDN'T HAVE AN EXAMPLE, HAD SEEN
3 A LOCAL AUTOMOTIVE STORE, EXCEL AUTOMOTIVE, NOW
4 SENDS OUT A COUPON WITH THE WRAP LOGO ON IT
5 INVITING PEOPLE TO COME TO THEIR SERVICES, PROUDLY
6 STATING THAT THEY'RE A WRAP WINNER. WHO ELSE?
7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THE BREWERY UP IN
8 HUMBOLDT COUNTY.
9 MR. HUNTS: WE BROUGHT AN EXAMPLE OF
10 THAT.
11 MS. TRGOVCICH: THIS IS A STATE LEASE,
12 NOT STATE OWNED BUILDING.
13 MS. HENNESSY: MAD RIVER BREWING COMPANY
14 USES THE LOGO ON THE BOTTOM OF THEIR SIX PACKS.
15 THEY'VE PUT THE WRAP WINNER LOGO, ALONG WITH THE
16 LOGO AND NOTICE ABOUT HOW THEY ARE INVOLVED WITH
17 THE CELMONT AND RESTORATION FEDERATION UP THERE ON
18 THAT AREA.
19 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: DAN HAS GOT NOTHING TO
20 WORRY ABOUT, JEFF.
21 MS. HENNESSY: DOLE FRESH VEGETABLES IN
22 SALINAS IS USING THE WRAP LOGO. I HAVE NOT SEEN
23 IT YET, BUT THEY SAID THEY WILL BE USING IT ON
24 THEIR INVOICES AND THEIR LETTUCE BOXES. AND THERE
25 ARE SEVERAL OTHER EXAMPLES. WE'RE GOING TO START

1 A PORTFOLIO OF THOSE.

2 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: GREAT. EXCELLENT.

3 ONCE AGAIN, WE'RE MAKING GREAT PROGRESS IN
4 EXPANDING THIS PROGRAM AND REACHING ALL DIFFERENT
5 SIZES AND TYPES OF BUSINESSES IN ALL DIFFERENT
6 CORNERS OF THE STATE. SO IT'S EXCITING.

7 ALL MY QUESTIONS ABOUT ELECTRONIC
8 STUFF ARE MOSTLY JUST MY CURIOSITY. I REALIZE
9 THAT WE'RE ALL LEARNING AS WE GO. AND THANK GOD
10 WE HAVE A GOOD SUPPORT STAFF WHO KNOWS THIS STUFF
11 AND IS ABLE TO TAKE IDEAS AND TURN THEM INTO
12 ELECTRONIC POSSIBILITIES AND REALITIES. NOT MEANT
13 AS CRITICISM, JUST CURIOSITY. THANK YOU.

14 OKAY. THE NEXT ITEM IS A PERENNIAL
15 ONE. CONSIDERATION OF SELECTION OF THE RPPC
16 ALL-CONTAINER RECYCLING RATE METHODOLOGY.

17 MS. TRGOVCICH: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
18 THIS ITEM WILL BE PRESENTED BY JOHN NUFFER, STEVE
19 STORELLI, AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM CASCADIA
20 CONSULTING FIRM. THE ONLY THING I'D LIKE TO SAY
21 IN ADVANCE OF THEM STARTING THIS ITEM IS A
22 DISTINCTION JUST TO BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION, THAT
23 THE PURPOSE OF THE ITEM BEFORE YOU TODAY IS NOT
24 THE DETERMINATION OF THE RATE, BUT SIMPLY THE
25 SELECTION OF THE APPROPRIATE METHODOLOGY, WHICH

1 WILL, AFTER BOARD APPROVAL, THEN SUBSEQUENTLY BE
2 USED TO DETERMINE THE ACTUAL RATE. SO THIS IS
3 METHODOLOGY CONSIDERATION ONLY.

4 WITH THAT, I'LL TURN IT OVER TO
5 JOHN.

6 MR. NUFFER: THANK YOU, CAREN. GOOD
7 MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. FRAZEE. MY NAME IS
8 JOHN NUFFER WITH THE WASTE PREVENTION AND MARKET
9 DEVELOPMENT DIVISION. WITH ME, AS CAREN SAID, ARE
10 STEVE STORELLI ALSO WITH THE DIVISION AND SUZIE
11 HABERLAND FROM CASCADIA CONSULTING GROUP.

12 WE'RE HERE TO RECOMMEND
13 COST-EFFECTIVE METHODS FOR DETERMINING THE
14 NUMERATOR AND THE DENOMINATOR OF THE RIGID PLASTIC
15 PACKAGING CONTAINER, RPPC, RECYCLING RATE FOR 1996
16 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.

17 STAFF RECOMMENDS CALCULATING THE
18 NUMERATOR USING A STAFF SURVEY OF PROCESSORS IF WE
19 CAN HELP FROM ANOTHER STATE AGENCY OR BY ADJUSTING
20 1995 RECYCLING DATA.

21 WE RECOMMEND CALCULATING THE
22 DENOMINATOR BY EXTRAPOLATING 1996 RPPC GENERATION
23 FROM 1995 DATA.

24 AS BACKGROUND, I'LL FIRST DESCRIBE
25 THE PROCESS WHICH WAS FOLLOWED TO ARRIVE AT THE

1 RECOMMENDATIONS. SUZIE WILL THEN DESCRIBE THE
2 ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES AND DATA REQUIREMENTS
3 OF EACH OF THE FINAL EIGHT ALTERNATIVE METHODS WE
4 CONSIDERED. AND STEVE AND SUZIE WILL BOTH BE
5 AVAILABLE TO ANSWER TECHNICAL QUESTIONS.

6 THERE ARE ADVANTAGES AND
7 DISADVANTAGES WITH ALL THE METHODS WE ANALYZED.
8 THERE IS NO PERFECT METHOD. IN OTHER WORDS, THERE
9 IS NO METHOD WHICH IS VERY ACCURATE AND
10 INEXPENSIVE.

11 SINCE BOTH THE INTERESTED PARTIES
12 AND CASCADIA WEIGHTED QUALITY OF DATA MORE HEAVILY
13 THAN COST, AND SINCE THE BOARD'S BUDGET SEEMS TO
14 BE DECLINING, STAFF BELIEVED IT WAS IMPORTANT TO
15 BALANCE QUALITY OF DATA WITH THE COST OF
16 COLLECTING IT YEAR AFTER YEAR. THE BOARD
17 CONTRACTED WITH CASCADIA CONSULTING GROUP IN JULY
18 OF 1996. THE PURPOSE OF THE CONTRACT WAS TO HELP
19 THE BOARD EVALUATE POTENTIAL METHODS FOR
20 CALCULATING BOTH THE NUMERATOR AND THE DENOMINATOR
21 OF THE RPPC RECYCLING RATE TO RECOMMEND A
22 COST-EFFECTIVE METHOD FOR EACH TO THE BOARD AND TO
23 DETERMINE THE 1996 ALL-CONTAINER RECYCLING RATE.

24 TO ASSIST IN THIS EFFORT, THE BOARD
25 CONVENED A GROUP OF INTERESTED PARTIES. THESE

1 PARTIES INCLUDED PLASTICS RECYCLERS, RECLAIMERS,
2 AND PRODUCT MANUFACTURERS, THE AMERICAN PLASTICS
3 COUNCIL, NAPCOR, CALIFORNIANS AGAINST WASTE, THE
4 DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION DIVISION OF RECYCLING,
5 AND WASTE MANAGEMENT INC., AMONG OTHERS.

6 AT A MEETING OF THESE INTERESTED
7 PARTIES ON JANUARY 8, 1997, CASCADIA PRESENTED
8 NINE POTENTIAL METHODS FOR CALCULATING THE
9 NUMERATOR OF THE RECYCLING RATE AND NINE METHODS
10 FOR CALCULATING THE DENOMINATOR OF THE RECYCLING
11 RATE. AS YOU RECALL, THE NUMERATOR IS THE AMOUNT
12 OF RPPC'S RECYCLED, AND THE DENOMINATOR IS THE
13 TOTAL AMOUNT OF RPPC'S DISPOSED AND RECYCLED; IN
14 OTHER WORDS, GENERATED.

15 AT THAT JANUARY MEETING THE
16 INTERESTED PARTIES FIRST DEVELOPED A CRITERIA FOR
17 EVALUATING POTENTIAL METHODS. THESE CRITERIA
18 INCLUDED ACCURACY, DEFENSIBILITY, PRECISION,
19 AFFORDABILITY, REPEATABILITY, AND THE ABILITY TO
20 VALIDATE. THEY RANKED AND WEIGHTED EACH OF THE
21 CRITERIA. THEY THEN REDUCED THE LIST OF 18
22 POTENTIAL METHODS TO EIGHT, FIVE METHODS FOR
23 CALCULATING THE NUMERATOR AND THREE FOR
24 CALCULATING THE DENOMINATOR. SUZIE WILL DISCUSS
25 THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THESE METHODS

1 IN A MINUTE.

2 THE INTERESTED PARTIES ELIMINATED

3 THOSE THEY CONSIDERED TO BE GROSSLY INACCURATE OR

4 TOO EXPENSIVE. WITH THOSE CRITERIA IN MIND,

5 CASCADIA EVALUATED THE ADVANTAGES AND

6 DISADVANTAGES OF THE EIGHT REMAINING METHODS.

7 CASCADIA'S EVALUATION INCLUDED DATA AND STAFF

8 REQUIREMENTS.

9 THE EVALUATION WAS SUMMARIZED IN A

10 DRAFT REPORT. SUZIE PRESENTED THIS REPORT TO THE

11 INTERESTED PARTIES ON MARCH 20TH AT ANOTHER

12 MEETING. THE INTERESTED PARTIES THEN SEPARATELY

13 RANKED THE FIVE METHODS FOR CALCULATING THE

14 NUMERATOR AND THE THREE METHODS FOR CALCULATING

15 THE DENOMINATOR. FROM THIS RANKING THEY

16 RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD USE ANY ONE OF THREE

17 METHODS FOR THE NUMERATOR AND ONLY ONE METHOD FOR

18 THE DENOMINATOR. THEY RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD

19 NOT CALCULATE A RECYCLING RATE IF IT DOES NOT

20 CHOOSE ONE OF THOSE METHODS.

21 AFTER THE MARCH 20TH MEETING, STAFF

22 SENT A SUMMARY TO EACH OF THE INTERESTED PARTIES.

23 AND NOW I'D LIKE TO TURN IT OVER TO SUZIE WHO WILL

24 DESCRIBE THE EIGHT METHODS WHICH THEY ANALYZED

25 MS. HABERLAND: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING,

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. I'M GOING TO
2 BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE METHODS THAT WE EVALUATED.
3 AS JOHN MENTIONED, WE STARTED OFF WITH A LIST OF
4 18; AND WITH DISCUSSIONS WITH THE INTERESTED
5 PARTIES, THIS WAS NARROWED DOWN TO EIGHT WHICH WE
6 LOOKED AT MORE CLOSELY. FIVE OF THOSE METHODS
7 WERE FOR THE NUMERATOR AND THREE WERE FOR THE
8 DENOMINATOR.

9 ON THE NUMERATOR SIDE OF THE
10 EQUATION, WE LOOKED AT FIVE METHODS. THEY BROADLY
11 FALL INTO THREE CATEGORIES: CONDUCTING SURVEYS OF
12 THE RECLAIMERS, END USERS, AND EXPORTERS,
13 CONDUCTING SURVEYS OF PROCESSORS, OR ADJUSTING THE
14 1995 DATA.

15 METHODS ONE THROUGH THREE ALL
16 ADDRESS THE RECLAIMER, END USER, AND EXPORTER
17 SURVEY. AND JUST DEFINE WHAT WE'RE TALKING
18 ABOUT -- STEVE, IF YOU COULD MOVE AHEAD --
19 RECLAIMERS ARE THOSE ENTITIES THAT ARE INVOLVED IN
20 WASHING, FLAKING, AND GRINDING. AND END USERS,
21 WE'RE ONLY TALKING ABOUT THE END USERS WHO ARE
22 USING UNWASHED, RECOVERED PLASTICS TO MANUFACTURE
23 A PRODUCT, SUCH AS PLASTIC LUMBER. WE'RE NOT
24 CONSIDERING THE END USERS THAT ARE ALREADY USING A
25 RECLAIMED PLASTIC BECAUSE THEY'RE ALREADY BEING

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CAUGHT BY THE RECLAIMER SURVEY. AND THE EXPORTERS
2 ARE THOSE FOLKS WHO SHIP RPPC BALES OVERSEAS.
3 SO METHOD ONE WOULD BE FOR THE STAFF
4 TO ESSENTIALLY REPEAT THE SURVEY THAT WAS
5 CONDUCTED OF THE RECLAIMERS, END USERS, AND
6 EXPORTERS LAST YEAR, BUT TO DO IT IN-HOUSE. THIS
7 IS A CENSUS SURVEY, WHICH MEANS THAT WE'RE LOOKING
8 TO GET RESPONSES FROM EVERY RECLAIMER, END USER,
9 AND EXPORTER, AND THE ACCURACY OF THE SURVEY IS
10 DEPENDENT ON THE RESPONSE RATE.

11 IN THIS CASE IN METHOD ONE, STAFF
12 WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING AND
13 MAINTAINING THE CONTACT LIST, CREATING THE SURVEY
14 INSTRUMENT, ADMINISTERING THE SURVEY, AND
15 CONDUCTING THE ANALYSIS.

16 THE ADVANTAGES OF THIS METHOD ARE
17 THAT STAFF WOULD HAVE ACCESS TO PRIMARY DATA. IF
18 THERE WERE QUESTIONS ABOUT SPECIFIC COMPONENTS OF
19 THE NUMERATOR, THEY COULD ACCESS THAT DATA, BE
20 ABLE TO LOOK, MAYBE DO SOME FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS
21 WITH THE PARTICULAR RECLAIMER, END USER, EXPORTER,
22 AND PERHAPS MORE IMPORTANTLY STAFF WOULD GAIN A
23 VALUABLE INSIGHT INTO THE INDUSTRY THAT HAS
24 CONSEQUENCES FOR MARKET DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS, ETC.

25 ON THE FLIP SIDE, THE DISADVANTAGE

1 OF THIS APPROACH IS THAT OBTAINING A HIGH RESPONSE
2 RATE IS CONTINGENT ON GETTING COOPERATION FROM THE
3 PEOPLE YOU'RE TRYING TO SURVEY. AND IF YOU CANNOT
4 GUARANTEE CONFIDENTIALITY, YOU ARE NOT GOING TO
5 GET THOSE RESPONSES. AND THEN THE CONTACT LIST IS
6 DIFFICULT TO MAINTAIN WITHOUT HAVING EXPERT
7 KNOWLEDGE OF THE INDUSTRY.

8 FOR THIS METHOD WE BELIEVE THAT THE
9 RESPONSE RATE IS LIKELY TO BE SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER
10 THAN THE 1995 RESPONSE RATE PRIMARILY BECAUSE THE
11 STAFF DOESN'T HAVE THE DEVELOPED RELATIONSHIP WITH
12 THE RECLAIMERS, END USERS, AND EXPORTERS.

13 METHOD TWO IS AN OPTION TO REPEAT
14 LAST YEAR'S SURVEY. LAST YEAR THE RECLAIMER, END
15 USER, EXPORTER SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED BY R. W. BECK,
16 AND THAT IS THE AMERICAN PLASTICS COUNCIL'S
17 CONTRACTOR FOR THE NATIONAL RECYCLING RATE STUDY.
18 ORIGINALLY THIS CONCEPT WAS TO JUST PIGGY-BACK
19 ONTO THE NATIONAL RECYCLING RATE STUDY AND ASK
20 SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT CALIFORNIA. THAT'S NOT
21 POSSIBLE BECAUSE OF TWO THINGS. ONE, THE
22 DEFINITIONS OF RPPC'S IS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT
23 THAN WHAT THE NATIONAL RECYCLING RATE SURVEY IS
24 LOOKING FOR AND, SECOND, THE SCHEDULES ARE
25 DIFFERENT.

1 BUT, AGAIN, THIS WOULD BE REPEATING
2 LAST YEAR'S SURVEY, WOULD BE A CENSUS SURVEY.
3 STAFF WOULD STILL HAVE TO MANAGE THE CONTRACT WITH
4 R. W. BECK. AND I'D JUST LIKE TO REITERATE AGAIN
5 THAT IT WOULD BE A DIFFERENT SURVEY THAN THE
6 NATIONAL RECYCLING RATE SURVEY.

7 THE ADVANTAGES OF THIS METHOD ARE
8 THAT THE CONTRACTOR IS EXPERIENCED AND HAS THE
9 ESTABLISHED RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE SURVEY
10 RECIPIENTS, SO THEY'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO GET A
11 HIGHER RESPONSE RATE, AND IT'S A REPEAT OF ONE OF
12 THE APPROACHES USED LAST YEAR, WHICH RECEIVED
13 BROAD SUPPORT FROM THE INTERESTED PARTIES.

14 THE DISADVANTAGES, AS I MENTIONED
15 EARLIER, ARE THE DEFINITION OF RPPC'S, AND THE
16 SCHEDULE DIFFERENCES NECESSITATES A SEPARATE
17 SURVEY FROM THE NATIONAL RECYCLING RATE SURVEY.
18 AND ANOTHER IMPORTANT DISADVANTAGE, WHICH NOT ONLY
19 APPLIES TO METHOD TWO, BUT ALSO TO METHODS ONE AND
20 THREE AS WELL, IS THAT THE EXPORT QUANTITIES ARE
21 UNDER-REPORTED. THERE'S -- THE EXPORT QUANTITIES
22 ARE VERY DIFFICULT TO GET A HANDLE ON, AND THERE
23 WAS CONSENSUS LAST YEAR THAT THOSE FIGURES WERE
24 UNDER-REPORTED, BUT THERE WAS NO SENSE OF JUST HOW
25 UNDER-REPORTED THEY WERE.

1 BUT AGAIN, AS I SAID, NOT ONLY
2 APPLIES TO THIS APPROACH, BUT TO METHODS ONE AND
3 THREE AS WELL. THIS APPROACH IS MORE EXPENSIVE
4 THAN THE OTHER APPROACHES, BUT THE RESULTS ARE
5 CREDIBLE AND DEFENSIBLE.

6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO EXPORTING IS NOT
7 CONSIDERED RECYCLING. DID I HEAR YOU SAYING THAT
8 EXPORTING IS NOT BEING COUNTED AS RECYCLING?

9 MS. HABERLAND: NO. I'M JUST SAYING THE
10 QUANTITIES THAT WERE EXPORTED WERE UNDER-REPORTED
11 IN LAST YEAR'S SURVEY, AND THAT'S GOING TO
12 CONTINUE TO BE A PROBLEM BECAUSE THE EXPORT
13 QUANTITIES ARE VERY DIFFICULT TO GET A HANDLE ON
14 FOR SOME POLITICAL REASONS.

15 METHOD THREE IS TO HAVE THE CIWMB
16 STAFF SURVEY THE RESPONDENTS FROM LAST YEAR'S
17 RECLAIMER, END USER, AND EXPORTER SURVEY. THEY
18 WOULD ONLY SURVEY THOSE ENTITIES WHO RESPONDED TO
19 LAST YEAR'S SURVEY, AND LAST YEAR THERE WERE 48 OF
20 THOSE RESPONDENTS, AND THEY WOULD INQUIRE ON THE
21 QUANTITY OF RPPC'S RECYCLED IN 1996 OR FUTURE
22 YEARS.

23 THE ADVANTAGES OF THIS APPROACH ARE
24 THAT IT'S A VERY SMALL SAMPLE SIZE, RELATIVELY
25 SMALL SAMPLE SIZE, AND THE CONTACT LIST IS EASY TO

1 MANAGE BECAUSE IT REMAINS CONSTANT.

2 THE DISADVANTAGES IS THAT YOU ARE
3 NOT ACCOUNTING FOR CHANGES IN THE MARKET
4 STRUCTURE. IF NEW RECLAIMERS COME ON-LINE OR NEW
5 MANUFACTURERS COME ON-LINE, YOU'RE NOT NECESSARILY
6 CAPTURING THE MATERIAL THEY'RE HANDLING. AND
7 THAT'S BECAUSE YOU ARE MAKING THE ASSUMPTION THAT
8 THE 1995 SURVEY WAS COMPLETE.

9 THIS IS THE LEAST ACCURATE OF THE
10 FIVE NUMERATOR OPTIONS AND PRIMARILY BECAUSE IT
11 FAILS TO ACCOUNT FOR MARKET CHANGES IN THE
12 INFRASTRUCTURE.

13 METHOD FOUR IS A SURVEY OF THE RPPC
14 PROCESSORS. AND JUST TO CLARIFY WHAT WE MEAN BY
15 PROCESSORS, THOSE ENTITIES WHO ARE INVOLVED IN
16 SORTING AND BALING OF RPPC'S. FOR THIS APPROACH,
17 THE CIWMB STAFF OR CONTRACTOR WOULD CONDUCT A
18 SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA MRF'S AND PROCESSORS. AS
19 WITH THE RECLAIMER, EXPORTER, END USER SURVEY,
20 THIS IS A CENSUS SURVEY, SO THE HIGHER RESPONSE
21 RATE DIRECTLY CORRELATES TO HIGHER ACCURACY
22 LEVELS.

23 THE ADVANTAGES OF THIS METHOD ARE
24 THAT THE PROCESSORS ARE MORE LIKELY TO COOPERATE
25 WITH STAFF THAN ARE RECLAIMERS FOR ONE OF THE MAIN

1 REASONS BEING THAT THEY AT LEAST HAVE FAMILIARITY
2 WITH WHO THE BOARD IS AND THEY'RE LOCATED IN
3 CALIFORNIA, AND MORE DIRECTLY MEASURES CALIFORNIA
4 RPPC RECYCLING ACTIVITIES. RECLAIMERS ARE OFTEN
5 OBTAINING MATERIALS THAT ARE BEING CONSOLIDATED,
6 LIKE TAKING MATERIALS FROM CALIFORNIA, FOR
7 EXAMPLE, CONSOLIDATING THEM IN ANOTHER STATE, AND
8 THEN THE CONSOLIDATED MATERIAL GOES TO RECLAIMER.
9 FOR THE RECLAIMER TO BE ABLE TO
10 SEPARATE OUT WHAT MATERIAL IS COMING FROM
11 CALIFORNIA VERSUS WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THAT MATERIAL
12 IS COMING FROM ANOTHER STATE IS VERY DIFFICULT.
13 THEY DO THEIR BEST, AND WE HAVE PRETTY GOOD
14 ASSURANCES FROM LAST YEAR'S SURVEY THAT THE
15 RECLAIMERS ONLY REPORTED THOSE QUANTITIES THAT
16 THEY COULD ABSOLUTELY -- YOU KNOW, THAT THEY HAD A
17 TICKET, A SALES TICKET OR INVOICE ON, SHOWING
18 CALIFORNIA ORIGINATION. BUT THE PROCESSOR SURVEY,
19 THOUGH, IF YOU ARE MEASURING IT IN CALIFORNIA, YOU
20 DON'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT WHERE IS IT BEING
21 CONSOLIDATED IN OTHER STATES.
22 THE DISADVANTAGES OF THIS METHOD ARE
23 DURING THE ANALYSIS PORTION OF THE SURVEY, YOU
24 MUST CONTROL FOR DOUBLE-COUNTING. MATERIAL IS
25 GETTING BALED AND REBALED IN THIS STATE, GOING

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 FROM ONE PROCESSOR TO MAYBE A LARGER PROCESSOR, SO
2 YOU MUST ACCOUNT FOR DOUBLE-COUNTING. AND AS WITH
3 THE RECLAIMER, END USER, EXPORTER SURVEY, A HIGHER
4 RESPONSE RATE IS GOING TO BE OBTAINED IF CONFIDEN-
5 TIALITY ASSURANCES CAN BE GIVEN. THIS IS THE MOST
6 ACCURATE METHOD IF A HIGH RESPONSE RATE IS
7 OBTAINED, BUT REQUIRES A LARGER EFFORT PRIMARILY
8 BECAUSE THERE ARE MORE MRF'S AND PROCESSORS THAN
9 THERE ARE RECLAIMERS, END USERS, AND EXPORTERS.

10 METHOD FIVE IS TO ADJUST THE 1995
11 RPPC RECYCLING DATA. AND TO DO THIS, WE DEVELOPED
12 AN EQUATION WHICH SPLITS THE RECYCLING QUANTITY
13 INTO THREE SUBTOTALS. THE FIRST SUBTOTAL IS THE
14 PET SUBTOTAL. THE SECOND SUBTOTAL IS PRIVATE
15 COLLECTION PROGRAM SUBTOTAL ONLY FOR THE NON-PET
16 RESINS. AND PRIVATE COLLECTION PROGRAMS ARE
17 PROGRAMS SUCH AS DROP-OFF CENTERS, REDEMPTION
18 CENTERS, BUY-BACK PROGRAMS, COMMERCIAL COLLECTION
19 PROGRAMS. THEY'RE ESSENTIALLY THE NONMUNICIPAL
20 CURBSIDE PROGRAMS. AND THE THIRD PART OF THE
21 EQUATION IS THE MUNICIPAL CURBSIDE COLLECTION
22 SUBTOTAL, AGAIN ONLY FOR THE NON-PET RESINS
23 BECAUSE THE PET RESIN IS BEING SPLIT OFF IN ITS
24 OWN SEPARATE QUANTITY.

25 WHERE THE DATA WOULD COME FROM FOR

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 DOING THIS APPROACH, FOR THE PET DATA, WE WOULD
2 USE THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION DATA THAT THEY
3 COLLECT AND TRACK ON PET RECYCLING. LAST YEAR THE
4 PET QUANTITY ACCOUNTED FOR 46 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL
5 RPPC RECYCLING. FOR THE PRIVATE RECYCLING
6 SUBTOTAL, WE WOULD USE INFORMATION THAT DOC, THE
7 DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION, TRACKS ON THE NUMBER
8 OF FACILITIES IN OPERATION AND APPLY BY DIFFERENT
9 PROGRAM TYPES, SO THEY'RE TRACKING THEM SEPARATELY
10 FOR THE COLLECTION PROGRAMS VERSUS THE REDEMPTION
11 CENTERS, AND THEY HAVE FIGURES ON THAT BREAKDOWN.
12 OBTAIN THE UPDATED INFORMATION FROM THE DEPARTMENT
13 OF CONSERVATION FOR THE NUMBER OF FACILITIES AND
14 APPLY THOSE FIGURES TO THE AVERAGE POUNDS PER SITE
15 THAT WE OBTAINED IN THE 1995 SURVEY, AGAIN ONLY
16 FOR THE NON-PET RESINS. AND IN 1995 THE PRIVATE
17 RECYCLING ACTIVITIES ACCOUNTED FOR 20 PERCENT OF
18 THE TOTAL QUANTITIES OF RPPC'S RECYCLED.

19 FOR THE MUNICIPAL CURBSIDE PROGRAM
20 SUBTOTAL, WE WOULD CONDUCT A BRIEF SURVEY OR STAFF
21 WOULD CONDUCT A BRIEF SURVEY OF MUNICIPAL PROGRAMS
22 TO GET UPDATED INFORMATION ON THE CURBSIDE
23 PLASTICS COLLECTION JUST IN TOTAL. THEY -- YOU
24 COULD QUERY FOR RESIN BREAKDOWN, BUT MORE SIMPLE
25 WAY OF DOING IT IS JUST ASK FOR TOTAL QUANTITY OF

1 PLASTICS RECOVERED IN THE PROGRAM AND APPLY THE
2 RATE OF CHANGE BETWEEN 1995 AND 1996 TO THE 1995
3 RECYCLING QUANTITY. AND IN 1995 MUNICIPAL
4 PROGRAMS ACCOUNTED FOR 34 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL
5 RECYCLED QUANTITY.

6 THE ADVANTAGES OF THIS METHOD IS
7 THAT -- ARE THAT THE APPROACH IS STRAIGHTFORWARD,
8 AND IT USES A BLEND OF ADJUSTMENT FACTORS THAT
9 REFLECT CHANGES IN THE RPPC RECYCLING INFRA-
10 STRUCTURE. SO AS THE NUMBER OF FACILITIES
11 INCREASE OR DECREASE, THAT'S GETTING REFLECTED.
12 THE PET DATA IS VERY WELL TRACKED BY THE
13 DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION. AND BY TARGETING THE
14 MUNICIPAL PROGRAMS TO OBTAIN UPDATED INFORMATION
15 FROM THEM, YOU'RE REFLECTING THOSE CHANGES IN THE
16 INFRASTRUCTURE.

17 THE DISADVANTAGES ARE IT CAN ONLY BE
18 USED TO CALCULATE AN AGGREGATE RATE, AND IT LOSES
19 ACCURACY OVER THE YEARS IF ADDITIONAL RESEARCH
20 ISN'T DONE INTO, FOR EXAMPLE, HOW THE AVERAGE
21 POUNDS PER SITE AT THE PRIVATE RECYCLING
22 FACILITIES ARE CHANGING FROM YEAR TO YEAR. THIS
23 APPROACH IS COST-EFFECTIVE AND EASILY REPEATED,
24 BUT AS I JUST MENTIONED, ACCURACY SUFFERS IN THE
25 FUTURE YEARS.

1 IT'S OUR OPINION THAT IT'S RELIABLE
2 FOR 1996, BUT AN EFFORT WOULD BE NEEDED IN 1997
3 AND BEYOND TO UPDATE SOME OF THE PRIVATE RECYCLING
4 AVERAGE QUANTITY FIGURES TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT'S
5 MORE ACCURATE, AND THAT WOULDN'T BE THAT LARGE OF
6 AN EFFORT TO DO A SMALL SURVEY OF THOSE
7 FACILITIES.

8 NOW TURNING OVER TO THE DENOMINATOR,
9 THREE METHODS WERE EVALUATED. AND AGAIN, JUST
10 GOING BACK TO WHAT JOHN SAID EARLIER, WE STARTED
11 WITH NINE METHODS FOR THE DENOMINATOR. AND THESE
12 WERE THE ONLY THREE THAT WERE LEFT STANDING AFTER
13 MEETINGS WITH THE INTERESTED PARTIES. AND OPTIONS
14 WERE ONLY ELIMINATED IF IT WAS A CONSENSUS OF
15 EVERYONE AT THE MEETING THAT THOSE OPTIONS SHOULD
16 NOT BE CONSIDERED.

17 THE THREE METHODS WERE CONDUCTING A
18 WASTE COMPOSITION STUDY, PRORATING THE NATIONAL
19 RESIN SALES DATA, AND EXTRAPOLATING THE 1996
20 GENERATION FIGURE FROM THE 1995 DATA.

21 FOR METHOD SIX, CONDUCTING A WASTE
22 COMPOSITION STUDY, WE WOULD BE ESSENTIALLY
23 REPEATING WHAT WAS DONE LAST YEAR, CONDUCTING A
24 WASTE COMPOSITION STUDY TO DETERMINE THE QUANTITY
25 OF RPPC'S DISPOSED IN THE STATE. AND TO GET THE

1 QUANTITY GENERATED, YOU WOULD THEN HAVE TO ADD THE
2 TOTAL QUANTITY OF RPPC'S RECYCLED. YOU WOULD USE
3 THE CIWMB APPROVED PROTOCOL, AND THIS APPROACH
4 COULD BE CONDUCTED BY STAFF OR A CONTRACTOR.

5 THE ADVANTAGES OF THIS APPROACH ARE
6 THAT IT DIRECTLY MEASURES THE QUANTITY OF RPPC'S
7 BEING DISPOSED IN CALIFORNIA. IT COULD BE
8 COMBINED WITH A BROADER WASTE CHARACTERIZATION
9 STUDY AT LITTLE OR NO ADDITIONAL COST.

10 THE DISADVANTAGES OF THIS APPROACH
11 ARE THAT IT'S TOO LATE TO USE THIS METHOD FOR
12 CALCULATING THE 1996 AND 1997 RATE. 1996 HAS
13 ALREADY COME AND GONE. TO PROPERLY COME UP WITH
14 THE 1996 DISPOSAL, YOU WOULD HAVE HAD TO HAVE
15 SORTED IN 1996; AND 1997, COULD PROBABLY DO
16 SOMETHING, BUT IT'S ALREADY, YOU KNOW, FOUR MONTHS
17 INTO THE YEAR. YOU'RE LOSING ONE OF THE SEASONAL
18 FACTORS.

19 ANOTHER DISADVANTAGE IS THAT THE
20 TOTAL DISPOSAL FIGURE IS COMPILED BY THE BOARD OF
21 EQUALIZATION. THIS WAS A STICKING POINT IN LAST
22 YEAR'S DELIBERATIONS WITH THE RECYCLING RATE
23 ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON JUST HOW ACCURATE THIS
24 FIGURE WAS, ETC. THIS APPROACH IS TIME-CONSUMING
25 AND COSTLY, BUT IS VERY ACCURATE, AND THERE WAS

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 BROAD CONSENSUS ON THE PART OF THE INTERESTED
2 PARTIES THAT THIS WAS THE MOST ACCURATE METHOD.
3 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I HAVE A QUESTION
4 ABOUT IT BASED ON CASCADIA'S EXPERIENCE. HAVE YOU
5 DETERMINED OR HAS STAFF DETERMINED WHAT THE
6 MINIMUM NUMBER OF SURVEY SAMPLES THAT WOULD BE
7 NEEDED TO GET ACCURATE DATA FOR THIS, WHETHER OR
8 NOT THE LEVEL OF SURVEY -- THIS IS A SECONDARY
9 QUESTION THAT'S RELATED -- WHETHER OR NOT THE
10 LEVEL OF SURVEY THAT WAS DONE LAST YEAR WAS MORE,
11 LESS, OR EXACTLY THE MINIMUM THAT -- THAT'S NEEDED
12 TO COME UP WITH NUMBERS THAT COULD BE CONSIDERED
13 DEFENSIBLE?
14 MS. HABERLAND: FOR THE WASTE COMPOSITION
15 STUDY?
16 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: YEAH.
17 MS. HABERLAND: THE NUMBER OF SAMPLES,
18 THERE WERE 900 SAMPLES OR 889, CLOSE TO 900
19 SAMPLES TAKEN LAST YEAR. AND THAT WAS THE MINIMUM
20 NEEDED TO HAVE A RESPONSE RATE WITHIN A 90-PERCENT
21 CONFIDENCE INTERVAL. SO IF YOU BROADEN THE
22 CONFIDENCE INTERVAL, YOU COULD TAKE FEWER SAMPLES.
23 ONE OF THE INTERESTING THINGS FROM
24 THE SURVEY OR THE WASTE COMPOSITION STUDY
25 CONDUCTED LAST YEAR OR ALMOST TWO YEARS AGO NOW

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 WERE THAT THERE WAS AMAZING CONSISTENCY IN THE
2 SAMPLES. SO THE RESULTS WERE VERY PRECISE. THAT
3 MEANS THERE WAS LITTLE -- FROM ONE SAMPLE TO
4 ANOTHER, YOU PRETTY MUCH SAW THE SAME TYPES OF
5 RPPC'S OVER AND OVER AGAIN. SO THAT -- WITH THAT
6 IN MIND, YOU COULD POSSIBLY REDUCE THE NUMBER OF
7 SAMPLES AND STILL HAVE A VERY PRECISE MEASUREMENT,
8 BUT YOU WOULD STILL BE GROWING YOUR CONFIDENCE
9 INTERVAL. SO YOU ARE DOING A TRADE-OFF BETWEEN
10 HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU IN THE ANSWERS AND HOW
11 PRECISE THE ANSWERS ARE.

12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WAS ANY OF THAT
13 DISCUSSED AT THE COMMITTEE ABOUT HOW IT WOULD BE
14 DONE? THE REASON I'M ASKING ALL THIS IS BECAUSE
15 COST HAS BEEN RAISED.

16 MS. HABERLAND: WHAT WAS DISCUSSED AT THE
17 COMMITTEE WAS MORE -- I GUESS STEVE AND JOHN COULD
18 CORRECT ME OR ADD TO THIS -- WAS MORE THAT -- THAT
19 IT COULD BE COMBINED WITH THE BROADER WASTE
20 CHARACTERIZATION STUDY, AND SOME OF THE FLAWS OF
21 THE EPA WASTE CHARACTERIZATION STUDY AND JUST THE
22 COST INVOLVED WITH DOING A BROADER WASTE
23 CHARACTERIZATION STUDY INSTEAD OF JUST DOING ONE
24 TO SORT THE RPPC'S.

25 REALLY YOU HAVE TO SORT THE GARBAGE

1 ANYWAY IF YOU'RE LOOKING JUST FOR RPPC'S, AND IT'S
2 REALLY NO ADDITIONAL TIME ON THE PART OF THE
3 SORTING CREW TO HAVE TO SORT INTO 60 CATEGORIES OR
4 TO SORT INTO TEN CATEGORIES. IT'S STILL THE SAME
5 AMOUNT OF EFFORT ON THEIR PART AT THE LEVEL OF
6 JUST HOW GOOD THE SORTING CREW IS.

7 MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAYBE JUST
8 TO GET TO, I THINK, PART OF WHAT YOU ARE ASKING AS
9 WELL -- MAYBE YOU'RE NOT, SO LET ME ASK YOU THIS
10 QUESTION. ARE YOU ASKING AS WELL DID THE
11 INTERESTED PARTIES LOOK AT GROWING THAT CONFIDENCE
12 INTERVAL AND REDUCING THE SAMPLE SIZE WHEN IT
13 CONSIDERED THIS METHODOLOGY?

14 AND SO THAT'S KIND OF THE LINE OF
15 YOUR QUESTIONING. AND ONE THING THAT I WOULD ASK
16 IS IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING FROM THE BRIEF PERIOD
17 OF TIME THAT I WAS IN THE MEETING THAT THE
18 INTERESTED PARTIES LOOKED AT THIS METHODOLOGY AS
19 BEING MOST ACCURATE, AND THAT HAD TO DO WITH, I
20 WOULD ASSUME, IN PART, THE CONFIDENCE INTERVAL
21 THAT WAS DETERMINED. SO I DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S
22 ANYTHING TO ADD ON THAT POINT, BUT THE ACCURACY
23 FIGURE WHICH THE GROUP ASSIGNED TO THIS METHOD-
24 OLOGY WAS BASED ON THAT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AND
25 THE NUMBER OF SAMPLES.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 MEMBER FRAZEE: BUT YOU WOULD STILL BE A
2 YEAR AND A HALF LATE WITH IT.

3 MS. HABERLAND: RIGHT.

4 MEMBER FRAZEE: IT WOULDN'T REFLECT 1996.

5 MS. HABERLAND: I THINK JOHN MENTIONED
6 THIS EARLIER, BUT THE INTERESTED PARTIES DID SAY
7 BECAUSE OF THE COST INVOLVED WITH THIS, ONE OF THE
8 THINGS THAT THEY WOULD PERHAPS CONSIDER AND WOULD
9 ENJOY WAS MAYBE CONDUCTING A WASTE COMPOSITION
10 STUDY EVERY FIVE YEARS OR EVERY THREE YEARS, AND
11 THEY ACKNOWLEDGED THAT IT WAS TOO LATE TO DO IT
12 THIS YEAR.

13 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: DID THEY DISCUSS THE
14 RAMIFICATIONS OF THAT QUESTION OF IT NOT BEING
15 AVAILABLE FOR 1996? WAS THERE ANY DISCUSSION
16 ABOUT THAT? HERE WE HAVE A METHOD THAT FOR THE
17 FIRST TIME IN A COUPLE YEARS WE HAVE THE RRAC
18 MEMBERS SEEMING TO AGREE. AND SO IT'S HARD FOR ME
19 TO JUST LIKE WALK AWAY FROM THAT WITHOUT ASKING A
20 FEW QUESTIONS. GEE, WHAT WERE THEY TALKING ABOUT
21 HERE?

22 MR. NUFFER: THEY DISCUSSED THAT MORE IN
23 THE LINE OF FUTURE -- I MEAN THEIR WHOLE LINE OF
24 DISCUSSION WAS ABOUT THE FUTURE AND DOING IT THREE
25 OR FOUR, FIVE YEARS AT A TIME. AND THEY DIDN'T --

1 AS I RECALL, THEY DIDN'T DISCUSS IT -- THEY DIDN'T
2 DISCUSS WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IN '96 OR FOR '97. IT
3 WAS USING THIS METHOD FOR CALCULATING THE RATE IN
4 FUTURE YEARS AND DOING IT EVERY THREE OR FOUR OR
5 FIVE YEARS AND COMBINING IT WITH OTHER NEEDS
6 THROUGHOUT THE BOARD SO THAT WE COULD DO A
7 COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.

8 MS. HABERLAND: ANY MORE QUESTIONS?

9 METHOD SEVEN IS PRORATING THE
10 NATIONAL RESIN SALES DATA. THIS METHOD INVOLVES
11 DETERMINING THE 1996 RPPC GENERATION BY PRORATING
12 THE SPI RESIN SALES DATA TO CALIFORNIA. AND
13 ESSENTIALLY WHAT WE'RE DOING WOULD BE STARTING
14 WITH THE SPI RESIN SALES DATA AND MAKING MULTIPLE
15 ADJUSTMENTS TO DESCRIBE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
16 NATIONAL RESIN SALES AND RPPC GENERATION IN
17 CALIFORNIA.

18 THE TYPES OF ADJUSTMENTS THAT WOULD
19 NEED TO BE FACTORED IN INCLUDE MANUFACTURING AND
20 DISTRIBUTION LOSSES, IMPORT/EXPORT, REUSE, AND
21 FACTORS SUCH AS THOSE. AND SO TO BE ABLE TO MAKE
22 THOSE FACTORS, YOU NEED TO GO OUT AND MEASURE WHAT
23 THOSE FACTORS AND APPLY THOSE TO THE NATIONAL
24 RESIN SALES DATA.

25 THE ADVANTAGE OF THIS APPROACH IS

1 THAT THE NATIONAL RESIN SALES DATA ARE COLLECTED
2 CONSISTENTLY BY SPI. THEY USE ACCOUNTING BASED
3 METHODOLOGY AND PRACTICES IN THE COMPILATION OF
4 THE RESIN SALE STATISTICS.

5 THE DISADVANTAGES IS THAT YOU'RE
6 RELYING ON NATIONAL DATA ABOUT RAW MATERIAL SALES
7 TO INFER CALIFORNIA SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON
8 PRODUCT AND ASSOCIATED PACKAGING SALES. AND THIS
9 IS A METHOD THAT STAFF ESSENTIALLY DID QUITE A BIT
10 OF WORK ON LAST AUGUST, LOOKING AT HOW THIS METHOD
11 COULD BE IMPLEMENTED.

12 THE INTERESTED PARTIES WANTED US TO
13 TAKE ONE MORE LOOK AT IT TO SEE IF WE COULD DO
14 ANYTHING WITH IT. BUT ESSENTIALLY IT BOILS DOWN
15 TO IT'S EXTREMELY EXPENSIVE IF YOU ARE DOING IT
16 CORRECTLY, AND IT'S HIGHLY INACCURATE IF IT'S JUST
17 DONE VERY POORLY AND ONLY MINIMAL ADJUSTMENTS ARE
18 MADE.

19 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO THE EXPENSE IS THE
20 PROBLEM OF TRYING TO CORRECT THE BACKING OUT OF
21 THE --

22 MS. HABERLAND: THE EXPENSE IS MEASURING
23 ALL THE FACTORS, GOING OUT AND MEASURING HOW MUCH
24 FROM THE NATIONAL SALES FROM THE RAW MATERIAL TO
25 AN ACTUAL PRODUCT OR PACKAGING MANUFACTURING, HOW

1 MUCH IS LOST IN THAT PROCESS, HOW MUCH IS LOST
2 ONCE THE PACKAGE, LIKE THE BOTTLE IS MADE, FOR
3 EXAMPLE, BUT THEN IT'S FILLED, SOME OF THAT GETS
4 LOST. SO ESSENTIALLY YOU'RE DOING SEVERAL STUDIES
5 ON MANUFACTURING LOSS, ON REUSE, ON IMPORT/
6 EXPORTS, AND YOU'RE NOT ONLY DOING IT WITHIN THE
7 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, YOU ARE DOING IT FROM THE
8 POINT THAT THE RAW RESIN IS MANUFACTURED TO
9 CALIFORNIA.

10 SO ONE OF THE METHODS THAT SEVERAL
11 MEMBERS OF THE INTERESTED PARTIES SUGGESTED WAS
12 INSTEAD OF TRYING TO MEASURE EACH OF THOSE
13 ADJUSTMENT FACTORS INDIVIDUALLY, TO USE THE
14 RESULTS OF THE 1995 STUDY AND DEFINE THAT
15 RELATIONSHIP. AND THAT BECAME METHOD NO. 8, WHICH
16 IS EXTRAPOLATING THE 1996 RPPC GENERATION USING
17 THE 1995 DATA.

18 WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE IS WE'RE USING
19 THE RESULTS OF THE 1995 STUDY FOR RPPC'S GENERATED
20 THAT WERE BASED ON THE WASTE COMPOSITION STUDY AND
21 THE RECYCLING SURVEYS AND COMPARING THOSE TO THE
22 NATIONAL RESIN SALES DATA FOR THE REPORTING
23 CATEGORIES THAT MOST RESEMBLE THE DEFINITION OF
24 RPPC'S AND DEFINING THAT RELATIONSHIP AS A RATIO.
25 SO -- AND THEN APPLYING THAT RATIO TO THE SAME

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CATEGORIES FOR THE 1996 SALES OR THE 1997 SALES OR
2 THE 1998 SALES.

3 AND THE ONE KIND OF CATCHER OF THIS
4 APPROACH IS THAT THE SALES CATEGORIES MUST REMAIN
5 CONSTANT FROM YEAR TO YEAR OR YOU NEED TO GO BACK
6 AND RECALCULATE THE RATIO.

7 THE ADVANTAGES, AGAIN THE NATIONAL
8 RESIN SALES DATA ARE COLLECTED CONSISTENTLY. AND
9 I'D JUST LIKE TO MAKE -- FINE-TUNE THIS A LITTLE
10 BIT. AT THE LAST MEETING THE INTERESTED PARTIES
11 WERE -- IN THE EXAMPLE WE USED IN THE REPORT, WE
12 USED MODERN PLASTICS DATA. AND THEY WERE PRETTY
13 STRONGLY AGAINST USING MODERN PLASTICS DATA FOR A
14 VARIETY OF REASONS WHICH ARE PRETTY WELL
15 DOCUMENTED. FOR EXAMPLE, MODERN PLASTICS BASES
16 THEIR REPORTING ON NINE MONTHS' WORTH OF DATA
17 INSTEAD OF A FULL YEAR'S WORTH OF DATA. AND SO
18 THEY SAID IF THIS APPROACH WERE TO BE USED, THAT
19 THEY INSISTED THAT WE USE SPI DATA, NOT MODERN
20 PLASTICS DATA OR ITERATION -- OTHER ITERATIONS OF
21 THE SPI DATA.

22 THIS APPROACH ACCOUNTS FOR CHANGES
23 IN RESIN APPLICATIONS BY PACKAGING TYPE, AND THIS
24 APPROACH IS STRAIGHTFORWARD.

25 THE DISADVANTAGES ARE THAT YOU ARE

1 NOT RELYING ON PRIMARY DATA COLLECTED IN
2 CALIFORNIA FOR THE CURRENT YEAR. AND THE
3 REPORTING -- THE SPI REPORTING CATEGORIES AREN'T
4 CONSISTENT WITH THE RPPC DEFINITION. SO EARLY ON
5 YOU NEED TO MAKE SOME DECISIONS ABOUT WHICH
6 CATEGORIES YOU ARE GOING TO INCLUDE FROM THE
7 NATIONAL SALES REPORTING CATEGORIES.

8 THIS IS THE MOST COST EFFECTIVE OF
9 THE DENOMINATOR APPROACHES. BUT AS WITH THE OTHER
10 ADJUSTMENT METHOD FOR THE NUMERATOR, IT LOSES
11 ACCURACY OVER THE YEARS BECAUSE YOU'RE BASING THE
12 RATIO ON A MEASUREMENT THAT WAS TAKEN IN 1995.

13 IF THERE AREN'T ANY MORE QUESTIONS,
14 I'LL TURN IT BACK OVER TO JOHN.

15 MR. NUFFER: THANKS, SUZIE. I'LL
16 SUMMARIZE BRIEFLY. THE INTERESTED PARTIES AND
17 CASCADIA WEIGHTED QUALITY OF DATA MORE HEAVILY
18 THAN COST. THE INTERESTED PARTIES WEIGHTED
19 QUALITY OF DATA, IN OTHER WORDS, ACCURACY,
20 DEFENSIBILITY, AND PRECISION AS 12 TIMES MORE
21 IMPORTANT THAN COST. CASCADIA WEIGHTED ACCURACY
22 AND DEFENSIBILITY AS THREE TIMES MORE IMPORTANT
23 THAN COST.

24 SINCE THE BOARD'S GOAL WAS TO
25 DEVELOP A COST-EFFECTIVE METHODOLOGY FOR

1 CALCULATING THE RPPC RECYCLING RATE, AND SINCE THE
2 BOARD'S BUDGET IS LIKELY TO CONTINUE SHRINKING AS
3 WE SUCCESSFULLY DIVERT MORE WASTE FROM DISPOSAL,
4 STAFF BELIEVES IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO BALANCE
5 QUALITY OF DATA WITH THE COST OF COLLECTING IT.

6 THEREFORE, FOR THE NUMERATOR WE
7 RECOMMEND METHOD TWO, THE STAFF SURVEY OF
8 CALIFORNIA PROCESSORS, IF WE CAN, WITH ANOTHER
9 STATE AGENCY OR IF WE CAN HAVE A CONTRACTOR
10 COLLECT DATA FOR US. THIS IS ONE OF THREE METHODS
11 RECOMMENDED BY THE INTERESTED PARTIES. IT WOULD
12 BE THE MOST ACCURATE OF THE THREE NUMERATOR
13 ALTERNATIVES WITH A HIGH SURVEY RESPONSE RATE.

14 IT HAS A MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD PRICE
15 TAG; HOWEVER, IF STAFF CAN'T GET HELP COLLECTING
16 DATA FOR THIS METHOD, THEN WE RECOMMEND ADJUSTING
17 1995 RECYCLING DATA. STAFF COULD DO THIS IN-HOUSE
18 FAIRLY EASILY AND AT A RELATIVELY LOW COST.

19 FOR THE DENOMINATOR, STAFF IS
20 RECOMMENDING METHOD EIGHT, AN EXTRAPOLATION OF
21 1996 RPPC GENERATION DATA. THIS IS CURRENTLY THE
22 MOST AFFORDABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR THE THREE METHODS
23 ANALYZED. THE INTERESTED PARTIES, HOWEVER,
24 RECOMMENDED CONDUCTING A WASTE COMPOSITION STUDY;
25 BUT BECAUSE OF THE HIGHER COST OF A WASTE

1 COMPOSITION STUDY, THE INTERESTED PARTIES
2 SUGGESTED DOING IT ONLY ONCE EVERY THREE OR FOUR
3 OR FIVE YEARS. IT WOULDN'T BE POSSIBLE TO DO IT
4 FOR 1996.

5 THE OTHER ALTERNATIVE, PRORATING
6 NATIONAL RESIN SALES DATA WOULD ALSO BE EXPENSIVE
7 AND NOT VERY RELIABLE.

8 AND THAT CONCLUDES THE PRESENTATION.
9 WE'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS.

10 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WELL, FOR THE
11 NUMERATOR, IT DOESN'T SEEM THAT THERE'S PROBABLY
12 GOING TO BE MUCH -- I MEAN THERE'S PROBABLY
13 AGREEMENT. I CERTAINLY AM IN SUPPORT OF WHAT
14 STAFF HAS RECOMMENDED.

15 FOR THE DENOMINATOR, AS I SAID
16 EARLIER, IT'S VERY HARD TO WALK AWAY FROM THESE
17 PREVIOUSLY, USE THE TERM, WARRING PARTIES, SAYING,
18 YEAH, WE COULD GO WITH THAT AND NOT TRY TO BUILD
19 ON THAT SOMEHOW. AND I'M JUST VERY CURIOUS ABOUT
20 WHAT OTHER TYPES OF WASTE COMPOSITION STUDY NEEDS
21 MIGHT EXIST BOTH WITHIN OTHER BOARD PROGRAMS, BUT
22 ALSO WITH OTHER PARTIES, LOCAL GOVERNMENT, PRIVATE
23 INDUSTRY, WASTE HAULER, OTHER STATE AGENCIES, A
24 VARIETY OF DIFFERENT POTENTIAL DATA NEEDS THAT
25 COULD MOST POSSIBLY BE JOINED TOGETHER AND BEAR

1 THE EXPENSE IN ORDER TO GENERATE A BROADLY
2 CREDIBLE DATA SOURCE ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE
3 WASTESTREAM THAT COULD BE USED FOR THIS PURPOSE
4 AMONG MANY.

5 AND SO I'M RELUCTANT RIGHT NOW TO
6 RECOMMEND ANYTHING ELSE TO THE BOARD. I THINK
7 THERE'S ALSO THE QUESTION OF WHAT DO WE DO FOR
8 1996 THAT WOULD NEED TO BE ADDRESSED, BUT I'M NOT
9 PREPARED TO ABANDON THE IDEA OF THE WASTE
10 COMPOSITION SURVEY AS AN ONGOING PROCESS THAT
11 COULD BE FUNDED FROM -- THROUGH PUBLIC/PRIVATE
12 PARTNERSHIPS OR INTERAGENCY PARTNERSHIPS.

13 IT'S ALSO POSSIBLE SOME OF THE
14 LARGER LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN THE STATE MAY BE
15 ALREADY PLANNING TO DO SOME OF THIS KIND OF WORK
16 OR MAY BE IN THE PROCESS RIGHT NOW, SUCH AS THE
17 CITY OF LOS ANGELES, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT COULD TAKE
18 CARE OF PORTIONS OF THE COST OF DOING THIS KIND OF
19 WORK.

20 SO UNTIL WE HAVE SAT DOWN AND
21 BRAINSTORMED THAT SORT OF THING, I HAVE A HARD
22 TIME WALKING AWAY FROM WHAT SEEMS TO HAVE SOME
23 CONSENSUS SUPPORT FROM THE VARIOUS PARTIES THAT
24 ARE NOW BEING REFERRED TO AS THE INTERESTED
25 PARTIES, WHAT I REFERRED TO AS THE RRAC COMMITTEE.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, ARE YOU
2 THEN LOOKING AT POTENTIALLY PARTITIONING THE
3 COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION AROUND THE DENOMINATOR
4 TO A METHODOLOGY THAT WOULD COVER '96 AND '97
5 SINCE, AS WE ALL KNOW, WE'RE IN '97 RIGHT NOW, AND
6 WE HAVE -- SO '96 DATA WOULD BE UNAVAILABLE, AND
7 FOR PURPOSES OF '97, WE'VE ALREADY PAST A SEASON'S
8 WORTH OF DATA SO YOU WOULDN'T HAVE THAT SEASONAL
9 VARIATION WHICH IS SO NECESSARY. SO WOULD YOU BE
10 LOOKING AT PARTITIONING YOUR RECOMMENDATION INTO
11 ONE APPROACH FOR 6-7 AND ANOTHER APPROACH FOR
12 FUTURE YEARS?

13 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: MAYBE. I'M NOT
14 PREPARED TO SAY THAT TODAY, AND I THINK WE'RE
15 PROBABLY GOING TO HAVE TO PASS THIS TO THE BOARD,
16 PENDING WHAT I HEAR FROM MR. FRAZEE HERE, WITHOUT
17 DECIDING THAT TODAY, BUT THAT'S A POSSIBILITY THAT
18 WE MIGHT NEED TO EXAMINE. ANY THOUGHTS?

19 MEMBER FRAZEE: NO. I'M COMFORTABLE WITH
20 THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND SPECIFICALLY FOR THE
21 REASON -- WELL, FIRST, OF COST, BUT ANY WASTE SORT
22 IS NOT GOING, AS WAS MENTIONED, IS NOT GOING TO BE
23 CURRENT. AND THAT'S CERTAINLY SOMETHING TO LOOK
24 AT IN THE FUTURE, BUT I THINK WE NEED TO GET THIS
25 ONE BEHIND US.

1 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THAT WAS KIND OF WHAT
2 I WAS SAYING LAST YEAR WAS LET'S GET THIS ONE
3 BEHIND US SO MAYBE WE CAN GET READY FOR NEXT YEAR.
4 AND BECAUSE WE GOT SO BOGGED DOWN IN LAST YEAR'S
5 CONFLICT, WE WOUND UP NOT READY TO REALLY GO
6 FORWARD THIS YEAR.

7 BUT I THINK AT THIS POINT WE
8 PROBABLY DON'T HAVE THE VOTES FOR A SPECIFIC
9 RECOMMENDATION ON THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION AT THIS
10 POINT TO THE BOARD, SO I THINK -- TO VOTE IT OUT
11 OF COMMITTEE, SO I THINK WE PROBABLY WILL FORWARD
12 IT WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION.

13 WE COULD APPROVE ACTUALLY THE
14 NUMERATOR RECOMMENDATION. MAYBE OUGHT TO
15 ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD THAT
16 WE ADOPT THE NUMERATOR RECOMMENDATION. AND I'LL
17 SECOND THAT, AND WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL
18 CALL.

19 WHAT TIME OF YEAR DID CASCADIA
20 PERFORM THE SORTS FOR 1995? WHICH MONTHS AND
21 WHICH YEARS TO GET US THE DATA?

22 MS. HABERLAND: I'M NOT SURE I HAVE THAT
23 WITH ME.

24 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WELL, THAT'S A
25 QUESTION.

1 MEMBER FRAZEE: IT WAS SEASONAL, BUT I
2 DON'T THINK THAT IT STARTED IN EARLY '95.

3 MS. TRGOVCICH: I THINK, TOO, WHETHER OR
4 NOT YOU WOULD NEED TO REFLECT THE SEASONAL
5 VARIATION, I WOULD DEFER TO CASCADIA ON THIS, BUT
6 MY GUESS WOULD BE THAT IN THE EVENT THAT YOU
7 FOCUSED THE WASTE COMP SOLELY TO RPPC, THAT MAY BE
8 LESS OF A FACTOR. IF YOU CHOOSE TO BROADEN THE
9 WASTE COMP TO OTHER CATEGORIES OR WASTE TYPES, IT
10 MAY BECOME MORE OF A FACTOR, SO IT WOULD REALLY
11 DEPEND UPON THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY THAT YOU WERE
12 WISHING TO PURSUE.

13 MS. HABERLAND: I WASN'T INVOLVED IN THE
14 WASTE COMPOSITION PORTION. I WAS IN CHARGE OF THE
15 RECYCLING SIDE OF THE EQUATION. AND UNFORTUNATELY
16 CHARLIE SCOTT WAS UNAVAILABLE TO COME DOWN TODAY,
17 BUT I COULD GET THAT INFORMATION TO YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL.

19 MS. TRGOVCICH: STEVE OR JOHN, DO YOU
20 KNOW WHAT TIME OF YEAR THE SORT WAS CONDUCTED?

21 MR. STORELLI: WELL, I RECALL A SUMMER
22 WASTE SORT, AND WE WERE SUPPOSED TO HAVE A WINTER
23 SORT; BUT BECAUSE THINGS GOT DELAYED, IT WAS MORE
24 OF A LATE FALL SORT IN LIEU OF A WINTER SORT.
25 THAT'S MY GENERAL RECOLLECTION.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO EVEN THOUGH WE ARE
2 NOT IN 1996, IT IS CONCEIVABLE THAT WITH AT LEAST
3 SIMILAR, IF NOT GREATER CREDIBILITY, WE COULD GET
4 AT LEAST THOSE TWO PORTIONS OF THE YEAR. WE
5 OBVIOUSLY COULDN'T GET THE SPRING OF 1997.

6 MS. TRGOVCICH: THE ONLY THING THAT I'D
7 LIKE TO POINT OUT, WHICH IS PRETTY OBVIOUS, IS
8 THAT A LOT OF THE DEBATE -- YOU KNOW, WE DID DO A
9 WASTE COMP. WE DID THIS METHODOLOGY FOR 1995
10 DATA. AND THE CONTROVERSY WAS MORE AROUND THE
11 INTRICACIES OF THE APPROACH THAT WAS USED, THE WAY
12 RANDOM SAMPLES WERE RANDOMLY SELECTED, ETC. AND
13 SO TO BE ABLE TO MOVE TO GET A SUMMER SORT AT THIS
14 POINT IN TIME, NOT HAVING EVEN GOTTEN TO THE
15 CONTRACT CONCEPT STAGE, LET ALONE THE SELECTION OF
16 A CONTRACTOR, LET ALONE THE CONVENING OF
17 INTERESTED PARTIES TO REVIEW AND APPROVE THE
18 METHODOLOGY, IT MAY BE AMBITIOUS.

19 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WELL, WE WILL CONTINUE
20 THE -- WE WILL NOT MAKE A RECOMMENDATION ON THE
21 DENOMINATOR PORTION OF THE ITEM, AND IT WILL BE
22 CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD AT THE MONTHLY BOARD
23 MEETING. AND I APPRECIATE THE PRESENTATION AND
24 THE CONTINUING EDUCATION ON ALL THE DETAILS OF
25 THIS STUFF, YOU KNOW. NEVER KNEW WE WERE GOING TO

1 BECOME SUCH EXPERTS AT THE PLASTIC COMPOSITION OF
2 THE CALIFORNIA WASTESTREAM.

3 SO THAT CONCLUDES THE REGULAR AGENDA
4 ITEMS, AM I CORRECT? BUT I DO HAVE A REQUEST
5 UNDER PUBLIC COMMENT FROM EVAN EDGAR, REPRESENTING
6 CRRC, TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE.

7 MR. EDGAR: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND
8 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE. MY NAME IS EVAN EDGAR,
9 REPRESENTING THE CALIFORNIA REFUSE REMOVAL
10 COUNCIL. SORRY I WAS LATE TODAY. I WAS AT THE
11 CAPITOL AND WASN'T ABLE TO TESTIFY IN SUPPORT OF
12 THE ITEM NO. 14, WHICH IS ABOUT THE ENFORCEMENT
13 OPTIONS FOR THE SUBMITTAL OF THE DOCUMENTS.

14 DURING THE 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE, WE
15 TESTIFIED ON THE NEED TO ENFORCE THE 25-PERCENT
16 MANDATE AND THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO GET TO 25
17 PERCENT IN ORDER FOR INDUSTRY AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT
18 TO REACH THE 50-PERCENT GOAL. WE ARE VERY HAPPY
19 TO SEE THE WASTE BOARD TAKING A LEADERSHIP NEEDED
20 TO SEND AN ENFORCEMENT MESSAGE BACK TO LOCAL
21 GOVERNMENT, THAT THE 25-PERCENT GOAL AND THE
22 SRRE'S ARE A REALITY. YOU NEED TO SUBMIT THOSE.
23 WE NEED THAT IN ORDER TO GET TO THE 50 PERCENT.

24 IN THIS ERA OF WEAK MARKETS AND
25 PEOPLE USING PROP 218 AS AN EXCUSE AND LANDFILL

1 PRICING, THERE'S A LOT OF SIGNALS GOING THE OTHER
2 WAY AGAINST THE 50-PERCENT GOAL. IT'S GREAT TO
3 SEE A POSITIVE SIGNAL IN SUPPORT OF THE 25-PERCENT
4 MANDATE AND THE SRRE IN ORDER TO SEND A MESSAGE TO
5 LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAT WE ARE SERIOUS ABOUT HITTING
6 THAT GOAL. SO THANK YOU FOR YOUR LEADERSHIP ON
7 THAT MATTER. IT'S GOING TO BE RECEIVED IN LOCAL
8 GOVERNMENT, I HOPE, IN A POSITIVE MANNER, WHICH
9 WE'VE ALREADY SEEN IN SOME COMMUNITIES ABOUT THEM
10 STEPPING UP TO DO THE DOCUMENTS.

11 ON A SECOND NOTE, I'D LIKE TO
12 PROVIDE A QUICK UPDATE ON THE BASE YEAR. WE HAD
13 AN INFORMAL STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP IN NEWPORT BEACH
14 LAST WEEK ON FRIDAY WITH A COUPLE BOARD MEMBERS,
15 SOME STAFF MEMBERS, L.A. SAN, MYSELF, A COUPLE
16 HAULERS FROM DOWN SOUTH TALKING ABOUT THE L.A.
17 BASIN.

18 IT WAS A VERY POSITIVE MEETING
19 CONDUCTED BY -- WITH PAT SCHIAVO, AS WELL AS MITCH
20 WEISS. AND WHAT WE TALKED ABOUT WAS A THREE-TRACK
21 STRATEGY. AND WE'D LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT THAT NEXT
22 WEEK AT THE FULL BOARD MEETING WHEN WE HAVE A
23 LOCAL REPRESENTATIVE FROM L.A., ONE OF OUR TRADE
24 ASSOCIATIONS, A COUNTY TRADE ASSOCIATION CALLED
25 THE INLAND EMPIRE, WHICH IS A COUNTY ASSOCIATION

1 FOR CRRC, A GENTLEMAN NAMED PAUL RYAN, WHO IS VERY
2 WELL INVOLVED WITH THE L.A. BASE YEAR, WOULD LIKE
3 TO MAKE A TESTIMONY WITH MYSELF ABOUT SOME IDEAS
4 HOW WE COULD WORK TOGETHER ON THIS ISSUE.

5 FIRST THING THAT WE ALL AGREED UPON
6 ON A CONSENSUS IN THIS GROUP WAS THAT WE NEED TO
7 GET THE WORD OUT. WAS IT A POLICY? WAS IT A
8 REGULATION? WHAT WAS IT? WHAT DOES IT MEAN?
9 WHAT DO WE DO WITH IT?

10 A LOT OF PEOPLE WERE CONFUSED ABOUT
11 WHAT HAPPENED LAST MONTH ON ADOPTED POLICY. I
12 BELIEVE THAT I GOT INFORMED, EDUCATED LAST FRIDAY.
13 I'M SURE THAT THAT TYPE OF VENUE WOULD BE GREAT
14 FOR OTHER PARTIES.

15 ON FRIDAY SWANA LEGISLATIVE TASK
16 FORCE HAS INVITED PAT SCHIAVO AND COMPANY TO SHOW
17 UP TO EDUCATE SWANA ON THIS VERY ISSUE.

18 SO GETTING THE WORD OUT WAS THE NO.
19 1 CONSENSUS ITEM THAT WE NEED TO MOVED FORWARD ON.

20 NO. 2 WAS WITHIN THIS ADOPTED POLICY
21 OR AS A VERBAL OR INHERENT UNDERSTANDING THAT
22 THERE WILL BE SOME FLEXIBILITY WITH ADEQUATE
23 JUSTIFICATION. SOME PEOPLE INTERPRET THAT THERE
24 WAS NO FLEXIBILITY. THERE'S VARIOUS PEOPLE WERE
25 UPSET WITH REGARDS TO THE FACT THAT HANDS WERE

1 TIED; BUT LOOKING AT IT CLOSER AND DISCUSSING IT
2 WITH STAFF, I HAD A COMFORT LEVEL KNOWING THAT
3 THERE IS FLEXIBILITY, THAT WHERE WE HAVE
4 JUSTIFICATION, I THINK THAT THE WASTE BOARD STAFF
5 AND WASTE BOARD WOULD CONSIDER THAT BASE-YEAR
6 ADJUSTMENTS WERE JUSTIFIED.

7 AND THE THIRD ASPECT OF IT IS MAYBE
8 REVISIT THE POLICY WITH ANY NEW IDEAS IN ORDER TO
9 MAINTAIN THE FLEXIBILITY SO WE DON'T HAVE TO GO
10 CASE-BY-CASE BASIS EACH AND EVERY TIME WHERE WE
11 HAVE NEW IDEAS THAT WORK IN ORDER TO ADJUST THE
12 BASE YEAR. MAYBE WE COULD REVISIT THE POLICY IN
13 ORDER TO EXPAND IT FURTHER.

14 NEXT WEEK I'D LIKE TO DO AN OPEN
15 DISCUSSION, IF POSSIBLE, WITH PAUL RYAN AND
16 MYSELF. CRRC WOULD LOVE TO FACILITATE DISCUSSION
17 DOWN SOUTH IN ORDER TO GET THIS WORD OUT TO OUR
18 HAULERS BECAUSE IN MANY CASES WE HAVE INDEMNIFIED
19 LOCAL GOVERNMENT. SO WHEN IT COMES TO AB 939
20 PENALTIES AND THE 25-PERCENT ENFORCEMENT GOAL
21 WHICH WE'RE SUPPORTING AS WELL, IT'S GOING TO COME
22 BACK AT US AS PART OF SOME OF THE CONTRACTS AND
23 FRANCHISES WE DO HAVE DOWN SOUTH. SO WE'D LIKE TO
24 BECOME AN INTEGRAL PLAYER WITH THAT IN ORDER TO
25 HELP MOVE THAT POLICY FORWARD.

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WELL, I, FOR ONE BOARD
2 MEMBER, WELCOME CRRC'S INTEREST AND PARTICIPATION.
3 I AGREE WITH YOU. THERE WAS SOME CONFUSION
4 CREATED ABOUT WHAT EXACTLY THE BOARD WAS DOING,
5 AND I THINK WE NEED TO GET THE WORD OUT. AND YOUR
6 ORGANIZATION HAS A ROLE TO PLAY IN HELPING TO DO
7 THAT. I'LL OFFER TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY SUCH
8 EFFORTS MYSELF IF IT WOULD BE HELPFUL.

9 AT THE BOARD MEETING WE WERE KIND OF
10 CAUGHT BETWEEN, ON THE ONE HAND, A PERCEPTION ON
11 THE PART OF SOME SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LOCAL
12 GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES THAT WE WERE BEING TOO
13 INFLEXIBLE IN TRYING TO FORCE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS
14 INTO A LIMITED SET OF OPTIONS FOR DEALING WITH
15 THEIR PROBLEMS. ON THE OTHER HAND, WE HAD THE
16 INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVE ON THE BOARD SAYING, YOU
17 KNOW, THIS IS TOO LOOSE AND THERE'S POTENTIALS FOR
18 ABUSE AND, YOU KNOW, THERE'S LOOPHOLES AND THERE'S
19 WAYS FOR LOCAL JURISDICTIONS TO NOT BE HELD
20 ACCOUNTABLE UNDER 939, WHICH, OF COURSE, WAS NOT
21 THE INTENT OF STAFF, I DON'T THINK. SINCE THEN
22 HE'S WORKED WITH STAFF, I THINK, TO ADDRESS SOME
23 OF THOSE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS THAT HE HAD.

24 BUT WHAT I SAID AT THE BOARD
25 MEETING, AND I WILL SAY AGAIN TO YOU AND I'LL SAY

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

1 IF I HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY AT ANY OF THESE
2 SESSIONS, THE BOARD, AFTER WORKING WITH A VERY
3 LARGE PERCENTAGE OF THE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS
4 AFFECTED BY THIS, CAME UP WITH AN INITIAL LIST OF
5 WAYS TO GO ABOUT ADDRESSING THE PROBLEM. BUT
6 WE -- THE BOARD, I THINK, INCLUDED IN ITS MOTION
7 THAT WE WEREN'T LIMITING OURSELVES TO THAT. I
8 THINK YOU BROUGHT UP AN IMPORTANT KEY PHRASE,
9 WHICH IS WITH JUSTIFICATION, YOU KNOW, THAT THOSE
10 WON'T WORK AND HERE'S WHY WE NEED ANOTHER OPTION.
11 I THINK THAT'S VALID.

12 BUT THE POINT WE PUT OUT AND WAS NOT
13 APPARENTLY AGREED WITH OR RECEIVED WELL BY SOME OF
14 THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES WAS THAT
15 WE'RE NOT TRYING TO FORCE ANYBODY INTO ANY OF
16 THESE MOLDS. WE RECOGNIZE THAT THE PROBLEM IS
17 DIFFERENT EVERYWHERE AND EVERYBODY HAS A DIFFERENT
18 SET OF PROBLEMS. AND MOSTLY WE WANT TO GET THE
19 PROBLEM TAKEN CARE OF, HAVE SOME CREDIBILITY FOR
20 THE NUMBERS SO THAT WE CAN LEGITIMATELY SAY THAT
21 WE'RE SOMEWHERE IN THE BALLPARK IN DETERMINING
22 WHETHER EACH JURISDICTION HAS, IN FACT, REACHED 25
23 PERCENT AND 50 PERCENT AND KEEP THIS PROCESS
24 MOVING FORWARD TOWARDS 50, SO WE'RE NOT SITTING
25 AROUND ARGUING ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED IN 1990, YOU

1 KNOW.

2 I THINK THAT THOSE ARE PRETTY
3 CRITICAL GOALS FOR THE BOARD. AND SO THE
4 CONSTRUCTIVE OFFER ON YOUR PART TO HELP WITH THAT
5 IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.

6 MR. EDGAR: AND THE FRANCHISE HAULER AND
7 CRRRC WERE THERE IN 1990. IF YOU LOOK AT THE
8 RECORD, THAT THE PEOPLE WHO DID STEP UP WITH GOOD
9 NUMBERS IN 1990 AS BASE YEAR WERE THE HAULERS AND
10 THE FRANCHISE HAULERS WITH TONNAGE BY JURISDIC-
11 TION. WHAT THE PROBLEM WAS IN 1990, I'VE
12 DISCOVERED, WAS ALL THE UNLICENSED, UNFRANCHISED
13 HAULERS WHO WEREN'T ASSIGNING THE TONNAGE TO THE
14 RIGHT JURISDICTION. SO WE WERE THERE IN 1990;
15 WE'LL BE THERE IN '95 AND THE YEAR 2000. THANK
16 YOU.

17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THANKS A LOT, EVAN.
18 THAT CONCLUDES OUR MEETING FOR TODAY.

19

20 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT
21 12:10 P.M.)

22

23

24

25

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.